



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1999

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are thankful, gracious God, that You give us a vision of a world where justice reigns and where mercy and peace and reconciliation abide. Yet, we know too that You have given us minds with which to think, eyes with which to see, hands with which to work and hearts with which to love. Encourage us and all of Your people, dear God, to use the abilities and gifts that You have given so that while we pray and hear Your word we also go about our communities doing those good works that honor You and serve people in their need. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA FOR THE NEW CONGRESS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican agenda for the new Congress includes a middle class tax relief package, education improvements, saving Social Security and reforming that worthy cause, and a more effective, more efficient military.

Our agenda includes across the board tax cuts which means that anyone who pays Federal income taxes will get a tax cut. It includes education, legislation which will put more money into the classroom and less money into the pockets of an education bureaucracy here in Washington. It will include bipartisan Social Security reform so that seniors are protected, the soon-to-retire will get the benefits they have been promised and younger workers will have a system there for them when they retire as well.

It will include funding for the construction of a national missile defense system so that America will be safe from rogue nations who apparently are not impressed in the least bit that we have an ABM treaty with the Soviet Union, a country which thanks to Ronald Reagan no longer exists. It is an agenda that benefits all Americans and it is an agenda that rewards hard work, protects seniors, better educates our children and keeps America safe.

SLOBODAN MILOSEVIC MUST NOT SUCCEED

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, the United States is right to take forceful leadership to stop the systematic destruction of homes and villages and the slaughter of civilians in Kosova that has been ordered by Slobodan Milosevic, the Communist dictator of rump Yugoslavia. But in that process the United States must not be party to one last sellout of the human rights of the people of Kosova in this 20th century.

Milosevic, who supervised the killing of hundreds of thousands of Croats and Bosnians and the creation of at least two million refugees by his attacks on two other United Nations members will now brazenly plead to that very United Nations his right to utterly subjugate or, if not, to kill or drive into exile the two million Kosovars who make up 90 percent of the population of Kosova.

Milosevic must not succeed. The time has come for the United States to forcefully and unequivocally promote the ultimate right of self determination of the people of Kosova so they may live in peace and freedom in the 21st Century.

COMMONSENSE CONSERVATIVES TRUST THE PEOPLE TO INVEST IN THEIR OWN FUTURES

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest a few days ago when the President of the United States came to this Chamber and outlined some 80 new programs in the span of 75 minutes, and, Madam Speaker, indeed I believe it comes down to a question of trust, because how interesting

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H381

was the President's statement in subsequent days in Buffalo, New York?

Quoting the President now, Madam Speaker:

"We could give it," referring to the budget surplus, "We could give it," the budget surplus, "all back to you and hope you spend it right, but . . ."

Madam Speaker, that outlines a clear difference between the two major political parties. It is a question of who do we trust? Do we trust the government more to spend our money given the long history of wasteful Washington spending by this overgrown bureaucracy?

Madam Speaker, the majority party and the common-sense conservatives of this country trust the people. That is why we called for broad-based tax relief, so that all American families can save, spend and invest in their own future. It is a major difference. Indeed, Madam Speaker, it is a question of trust.

INTRODUCTION OF GIVE-FANS-A-CHANCE LEGISLATION

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, one of the tenets of a livable community is control over one's own destiny. Unfortunately, sports franchises have held communities hostage, pitting one city against another as they have left fans in Brooklyn, Hartford, Baltimore, Houston and Cleveland for greener pastures. It does not have to be that way.

Madam Speaker, that is why I am introducing Give-Fans-a-Chance legislation which guarantees due process for relocation and makes it at least possible for any city to do what little Green Bay, Wisconsin, has done: basically own their own team. But the NFL will not let that happen any more.

Any league which does not abide by these rules does not deserve the Federal antitrust broadcast exemption worth billions of dollars.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge giving fans a chance and making their communities a little more livable by providing them with the opportunity to control their own destiny not subject to the whim of some absentee billionaire.

ECONOMIC HEALTH AND NATIONAL SECURITY TIED TO STABILITY OF OUR DOMESTIC PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to address the House this morning to bring the attention to a grave matter, an economic crisis in the oil patch of this great Nation. I like for my colleagues to realize if there is not changes made within the next four months to five months, we will lose

over 50 percent of our production for marginal wells in the United States of America. Marginal wells produce about 1.3 million barrels a day. How much is that? That is equivalent to what we import from the Arab countries.

But we are about to turn that market over to other foreign sources and put us more dependent, and rest assured, between now and July the 4th, when we have Independence Day, we will be more dependent on foreign governments than ever before in the history of our country. I do not think that is what we want.

Madam Speaker, I call on the Speaker to set up an energy task force, a crisis task force. Also we must have hearings this month, move on this, and also we must establish a national energy policy before our national security is totally at risk.

BRIDGE TO THE 21ST CENTURY MADE OUT OF BANANA PEELS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, our Trade Representative said, and I quote:

"We going to the mat."

The trade rep said they will ask the White House to impose strict tariffs and sanctions on European goods over bananas.

That is right, bananas. Think about it. While Uncle Sam is prepared to wage a trade war over bananas, 10,000 steelworkers, 10,000, are receiving unemployment compensation.

□ 1015

Your workers, my workers, standing in unemployment lines, losing their homes, losing their jobs, and the White House is roaring like a titmouse over bananas.

Beam me up, ladies and gentlemen. What has happened to this country? I yield back all the tanks, submarines, and certainly this new bridge to the 21st Century, that will be made now out of banana peels.

TAX CUTS—THE MAJOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, it did not take long to find out what the major difference between Democrats and Republicans will be in this Congress: Tax cuts.

Republicans propose a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut, which the legislation of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) will do; and the Democrats, well, you guessed it, general tax relief is nowhere to be found. In fact, the President's budget will contain no middle class tax relief for an-

other 15 years. And we all know what targeted tax cuts are. That is a euphemism for "you won't be getting one."

The current budget surplus, taxpayer overpayment, to be more accurate, should go back to the people that it belongs to in the first place, the taxpayers.

April 15 is not far away, and the tax man cometh. The tax man has been taking too much for too long, and then wasting too much of that for too long. It is time to give the middle class average taxpayers a break. It is time for a tax cut.

STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, the Republicans are beginning the 106th Congress exactly where they left off in the 105th, and that is ignoring the will of the majority of the Americans.

If you recall, the Republican leadership in the House ended the 105th Congress by approving an \$80 billion tax break for the wealthiest Americans financed by raiding the Social Security surplus. As a result, the Democrats picked up 5 seats in the November election.

But, believe it or not, the Republicans are still not listening. Instead of directing the surplus to Social Security and Medicare, the Republicans are proposing a 10 percent tax cut which will do virtually nothing for 45 million American families. Under the Republican plan, the average annual tax cut for 60 percent of tax payers would be about \$100. Those earning more than \$300,000 though would receive an average tax cut of \$20,000.

I urge my Republican colleagues to listen to the American people. Read the writing on the wall and stop wasting time with a recycled plan to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy with money that should be used to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

THE RETURN OF BIG GOVERNMENT

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, today we gather in this House, we have things pretty good; but sometimes when things are too rosy, we lose track of where we are headed, and maybe what we ought to be looking at.

The surplus is certainly something that we are glad to have, and I think that Members of this body who have supported good policy over the last few years can take credit for that.

But in the President's address, I think something that is so badly needed that was lacking was how are we going to pay off the debt? The President's address should be entitled, "The

Return of Big Government." He declared the era of big government over just a couple of years ago, and now he is back with guns blazing: The return of big government.

We need to save Social Security, we need to reduce the debt, and we need to return to the American taxpayers some of the overpayment they are making.

PUTTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE FIRST

(Ms. STABENOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STABENOW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge our Republican colleagues to join with us in putting Social Security and Medicare first. We have come together to balance the budget, and we now have an extraordinary opportunity to take the next step in fiscal responsibility and make sure that our children and our grandchildren are protected for the future.

We need to make sure that Social Security and Medicare are protected first, and then we as Democrats will join and in fact lead the fight for tax cuts for middle class families. But, first and foremost, we need to pay down the debt and protect Social Security and Medicare.

We ask our Republican colleagues to join us in this critical, critical issue for the future of our children and our grandchildren.

THE SURPLUS BELONGS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise in response to the eloquent words of my Democratic colleague to say that yes, we too want very much to put Social Security and Medicare first. In fact, the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), has made it clear that he shares the goal of seeing that 62 percent figure, which the President called for in his State of the Union message, to shore up and ensure the strength of Social Security. At the same time, we have an overcharge, and the American people deserve a rebate.

Neither the administration nor Republicans in the Congress anticipated the tremendous flow of revenues that have come into the Federal Treasury as a by-product of the tremendous economic growth which has taken place because of the policies of this Congress and, yes, in working with the President.

But the fact is, the money belongs to the American people and we should do everything that we possibly can to ensure that that overcharge is in fact rebated. But we do share that priority of strengthening Social Security and Medicare, ensuring that we improve

public education, strengthening our national defense capability, and, of course, reducing that tax burden on working families.

PUT SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about the major problem facing American society, and that is how we deal with our aging population. I believe that the American population wants us to deal with the real problems, and that is Social Security and Medicare, and we must put that first. That is what the Democrats are proposing, that we solve the problem of Social Security first.

Now, on the Republican side of the aisle we have a reincarnation of that old TV show, "Tax Relief for the Rich." How can we figure out a way to give more money to the wealthy?

The public should not be fooled. This is not an across-the-board tax break. Look, if you are in the middle class, the average return that you will see is about \$100. Sixty percent of Americans will only get a tax return of \$100. But if you make over \$300,000, you will get \$20,000.

Who benefits from this so-called tax increase? The very wealthy. And that is the theme that the Republicans have repeatedly put forth: Tax relief for the wealthy, or as I like to call it, Robin Hood in reverse. We should put Social Security first and deal with the real problems of American society.

PROPOSED DEMOCRATIC BUDGET A SHAM

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the American public today is once again seeing what I consider to be really a sham and the downside of politics. One year ago, President Clinton said Social Security first, so Republicans matched the President and we said we are going to have a 90/10 plan: Of surplus dollars that would be available, 90 percent to Social Security, 10 percent to tax cuts.

We were beaten up on the floor of this House. "That is not enough. Ten percent to the rich Americans." Now the President, a year later, is saying Social Security now, 62 percent.

We as Republicans and as conservatives are going to match the President. We are trying to work with him. We believe that if that is the figure he is going to select, that is the figure we are going to stick with. And yet what the American public is being told is that Republicans are trying to give tax cuts to the rich. I hope America is listening.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS NEEDED

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, we are hearing a lot about bipartisan efforts this year, and I hope that is true. But last year as chairman of the Republican Health Tax Force in the 105th Congress our Speaker produced a bill that was not bipartisan and did not become law because of that purpose. I hope the effort to work on a bipartisan matter on important issues like HMO reform is not a repeat of last year.

I do join my colleagues on the Democratic side saying we need to save Social Security first, but I want to talk about the general issue of bipartisanship.

This year, with the Republican majority even smaller, in part due to their inaction on HMO reform, the time is now to pass those reforms. This year we need to have a Patients' Bill of Rights that protects patients, eliminating the gag clause, providing timely appeals, guaranteeing access to specialists and emergency rooms, allowing doctors determine what is medically necessary, but also, more importantly, making the decision maker for our health care responsible.

Accountability is what we need. If the doctor is not making that decision, then whoever is making that decision needs to be accountable and they need to have the liability.

Let us see how this bill passes, and, if it does not have that accountability, then it is a sham.

WORKING TOGETHER TO SOLVE IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, many of us were quite excited about the President's State of the Union message. He pointed out many things that all of us need to be concerned about in addressing.

Our side of the aisle wants very much to save Social Security; so does this side of the aisle. Our side of the aisle wants to strengthen national defense, just as the President does. Our side of the aisle wants to solve Medicare for the long term, just as that side of the aisle does.

So I hope as the 106th Congress begins, that we can work together, not for political gain, but to solve the problems facing the American people.

I think we have a unique opportunity in this Congress to do exactly that, because our side of the aisle agrees with many of the things that the President said. I look forward to the 106th Congress, to help solve some of these very important issues.

MAKE EDUCATION THE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the President again for including school construction tax credits in his fiscal year 2000 budget. The bond proposals that he has offered are based on concepts included in the legislation I just introduced.

When our Nation is facing the most rapid student enrollment increases ever in our history, we must ask, are our schools prepared?

I remember education being a top priority for candidates and incumbents in this past election season. Well, let us keep those promises from the election. Let us make education our number one priority.

I have been on this floor a number of times recounting the horror stories from my own district, about teachers working in closets, about 50 kids in every classroom, about those portable classrooms littering our playground blacktops. The stories that I have told just are not happening in Orange County, California; I know they must be happening in your districts also.

So I encourage the Speaker and the leadership and the Democrats to find a solution to this problem. Please, cosponsor H.R. 415 and support school construction tax cuts. Our children need it.

THE BEST SCHOOLS AND MILITARY AGENDA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, the Republican Party has a very good agenda, it is called BEST Schools and Military; B for balancing the budget, paying down the debt; E for excellence in education; S for saving Social Security; and T for lowering taxes, with the strongest military in the world.

We want to work with the President. I was encouraged with his State of the Union speech. But when the President starts getting obligations to the whacky fringe left, I get scared, because it scares my middle class voting constituency back home.

Yesterday the President said something very curious. He said we could give the budget surplus back to you and hope that you spend it right.

Who is he? Who are we to tell the American people we do not trust you with your money? This is the whacky fringe left at its best.

I believe the American taxpayers, the hard working, middle class moms and dads throughout the country, can spend their money quite well, without a bunch of busybody Washington bureaucrats telling them "We are smarter than you because we are elected and we are going to spend your money."

I disagree with the President. I think the American people can spend their money better than Congress in many cases.

□ 1030

SAVING THE BUDGET SURPLUS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE—NOT GOP TAX CUTS

(Mr. SHOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stress my strong support of using the budget surplus for saving Social Security and Medicare first.

We are not out of the woods yet on protecting Social Security, and to squander money away from the budget surplus to pay for a large indiscriminate tax cut would be irresponsible and would further put our Social Security system at risk.

I support tax cuts, but we have to target them where we need them. Target them for working families. Target them for business and development, and for research and development.

We must not put our Social Security system at risk. Saving Social Security first is my number one priority for the people of Mississippi's 4th District and it should be our number one priority as a Congress for the American people.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I have good news about my city and yours. This morning's paper reports that the District of Columbia has a \$450 million surplus and a clean audit. Yes, this is the same city that needed a control board three years ago and clearly does not need one now.

The District will not even have to use the authority Congress gave it to borrow and eliminate an operating deficit. The city will pay down that large deficit from its own revenue. The surplus is by no means all a matter of a good economy. Cuts in government redundancy and waste and improved tax collections have had a lot to do with it.

The District has a new mayor and a reinvigorated city council. A quiet revolution is in progress in the city where this House lives, right under our noses. Look for me to come to the floor often to tell my colleagues what they need to know and, I am sure, what they want to hear about a Nation's Capital where all can be proud.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, there is no better example of the loss of trust in government than our Social Security program. Social Security is one of the great accomplishments of our government in this century and one of the most successful programs in our history.

When Social Security was passed more than 60 years ago, a majority of the elderly lived in poverty, lived in fear of destitution in old age, and it was a fear that was crippling all of society. Today, Social Security benefits not just those who depend on Social Security primarily to put food on their table, but it benefits all of society.

Yet, in my district in New Jersey, and I believe in most of my colleagues' districts, we would be hard put to find anyone who thinks they will get a dime from Social Security for all of the taxes they have paid. That skepticism shows the serious problem of trust we face.

We must restore faith in this fundamental Federal program. That is why we must save Social Security first before we turn to tax cuts.

PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, in 1992, the Republicans' mantra when I was running for election the first time was deficit and national debt and the harm it was causing to our children and our children's future. Being the realist that I am, I came here and got immediately involved in doing away first with our deficit. The 1993 budget passed with only Democratic votes, and got us on the road to where we are today with a surplus. We did what we were supposed to do. We came up with a surplus. That is our challenge now.

What does the majority party do? What are they proposing? Rather than saving Social Security and in so doing, reducing the national debt, they return to their real mantra of spending our surplus on tax cuts, tax cuts that will give two-thirds of the wealthiest people in this Nation the benefit. It will give the top 10 to 20 percent of the well-off two-thirds of the benefit.

This will not reduce our national debt. It will not protect Social Security.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DENVER BRONCOS

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this past Sunday in the Super Bowl, the Denver Broncos defeated the Atlanta Falcons 34 to 19. It was a hard-fought game, and the Atlanta Dirty Birds came up a little short.

Today I rise to say congratulations to the Denver Broncos and to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Denver won the Super Bowl and our colleague won our friendly little bet. So this morning I presented to my colleague and her staff a month's supply of Georgia peanuts and Atlanta's own Coca-Cola. Enjoy the Coke and peanuts and the victory, while you can.

Next year the Dirty Birds will be back.

A SWEET VICTORY

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be standing here today with one of the most esteemed Members of Congress, and also one of the best sports in Congress, the gentleman from Atlanta (Mr. LEWIS) to celebrate our Denver Broncos' victory last Sunday. The Dirty Birds made a valiant effort, I say to my colleague, but our mighty Broncos were just too strong.

The victory was sweet. Its spoils are even sweeter. I would like to thank the Congressman from Atlanta and his staff for delivering the month's supply of Coca-Cola and the peanuts to our office. Very sweet indeed.

A sweet win for Mike Shannahan, who has proven once again he knows football better than any other coach in the NFL. A sweet victory for Terrell Davis, who continually racks up consecutive 100 yard games. But this does set a tradition of Super Bowl dominance. We need a three-peat. We need our quarterback, John Elway, to come back for the three-peat next year.

I would like to thank my colleague the gentleman from Atlanta (Mr. LEWIS) for being such a good sport. We are looking forward to seeing the Dirty Birds in the Super Bowl, and when we three-peat, we know the gentleman will be just as good a sport then as he is now.

POLITICALLY POPULAR PROMISES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, one of the main reasons the economy has been so strong over the last few years is that following the 1994 elections, we finally started bringing Federal spending under control. Alice Rivlin, who was the President's budget director, put out a memo in 1993 saying that if we did not make changes, we would have deficits of over \$1 trillion a year by the year 2010 and \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion a year by 2030. If we had allowed that to happen, our economy would have crashed. Now we are actually seeing surpluses.

But it is politically popular and very easy to promise everything to everybody. The National Taxpayers' Union

said the President's State of the Union address would require a \$288.4 billion increase in spending in the first year alone. Last week Newsweek magazine published a chart showing we would have a shortfall of \$2.3 trillion in the next 15 years if we enacted all of these programs.

If we do this, Madam Speaker, we will very quickly be in serious trouble in our economy once again. We must not let it happen.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY WITH BUDGET SURPLUS

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's plan to use the budget surplus to save Social Security. Our country is experiencing record economic growth; inflation is down; job growth and homeownership are up; and we are experiencing the first budget surplus in over a generation. I support the President's plan to use the budget surplus to ensure the long-term fiscal success of the Social Security program.

In my own district of Queens and the Bronx in New York, tens of thousands of people are able to retire with dignity because of the Social Security system. For all American seniors, Social Security is truly an American success story.

Madam Speaker, we must as a Congress work to ensure that this successful American program continues to be fiscally sound and economically successful in order to provide benefits for the baby boomers of today and the retirees of tomorrow. The President's budget ensures the long-term success of the Social Security system by providing tax cuts for working families. I urge my colleagues to support the use of the surplus to save Social Security.

SPENDING PRIORITIES

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. We have heard much debate today about saving Social Security and spending 62 percent of the surplus to do it. I agree with that 100 percent. Our Medicare has to be ensured to be there for our generation and the generation to come. The same is true for defense. How can we expect those defending our Nation to feed their family using food stamps? It is deplorable and we need to change that.

But if we listened to the President's State of the Union, it is obvious big government just came roaring back. When do we start trusting the American people? What do we do with the remaining 38 percent of the surplus if we are going to spend 62 percent for Social Security? Let us give the people their money back.

We talk about making sure we are going to better education for the future. When will we start trusting parents? When will we start trusting school boards? When will we start trusting teachers to provide education?

The Federal Government has 790 various programs associated with education. The mandates associated with those programs generally cost more to implement than they receive from the Federal Government. That has to be changed.

Let us start trusting parents; let us start trusting taxpayers; let us start trusting individuals with their rights.

ONE BAD DEAL

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, a 10 percent across-the-board income tax cut, what could sound more appealing, more simple, more fair?

Hearing those words, hard-working American taxpayers start dreaming about what they could do with the money. Replace that beater with a new car, repair the leaky roof, send their child to college, maybe take that long-awaited second honeymoon. Well, forget it.

The sad truth is that 77 percent of all taxpayers, nearly 35 million people, would receive no tax cut at all. A two-parent family of four with annual income below \$25,000 would get nothing.

So who benefits from that trillion-dollar tax cut over the next decade? Citizens for Tax Justice tell us it is the wealthiest Americans.

Here is the deal. Taxpayers earning \$38,000 get back \$99. Taxpayers earning over \$300,000 get a tax cut of \$20,000. For most of us, this is one bad deal.

ASSURING AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, let American workers have no doubt who is on their side. Across-the-board tax relief means all taxpayers will get to keep a little more of what they earn, not what Washington earns, what they earn. Unlike the approach offered by the other side whereby only some people get a tax cut while others do not, the Republican approach means that if one pays taxes, if one is giving up one's hard-earned paycheck, one is going to get a little more tax relief.

Our education reforms will cut the Federal bureaucracy and send more money directly down to teachers. Our Social Security reforms will protect seniors who are in the program, the near elderly, the baby boomers like myself, and especially those young people coming into a system they do not believe is ever going to be there when they need it at retirement.

Our proposal to build a long-term 21st century defense system will address new threats to our Nation. That

is how Republicans propose to secure America's future.

PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, last weekend I was back home in our district for the third time since being sworn in just a month ago, and I attended our senior lobby day and one question was on the lips of every senior there: What are you going to do to protect Social Security, and will you protect it for my children?

The President's budget has answered that question yes. Yes, we will protect Social Security. We will do so in a common sense way. We will set aside the surplus to protect Social Security, to protect Medicare, and to invest in our future. It is the right thing to do, it is the common sense thing to do, and it is what the American people and the people of my district of southwest Washington want us to do.

Madam Speaker, when this debate moves forward on how we will spend that surplus, I urge my colleagues and friends here, do the right thing. Protect Social Security for our current seniors and for our future generations.

□ 1045

REPUBLICANS WANT AMERICANS TO KEEP MORE OF THEIR HARD-EARNED MONEY, DEMOCRATS WANT MORE BIG GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MANZULLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, the issue is very simple. We want, on the Republican side, to allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. The Democrats want to increase the size of government.

Let me say that again so the message is clear. On the Republican side, we want the American people to keep more of their hard-earned dollars through tax cuts. On the Democratic side, they want to increase the size of government.

Let me say it again so the message is loud and clear. On the Republican side, we want the American workers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars through tax cuts. The Democrats want to spend more of our money.

Let me say it a fourth time, or do I have to? Who do we trust? Do we trust big government to spend our money, or do we trust yourself to spend more of our money through tax cuts?

THE DEMOCRAT PLAN WILL PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, we all of us here in Congress must speak out very loudly and very clearly about protecting the very foundations of our Nation's retirement security. Democrats say save the surplus to protect social security and Medicare.

Our Republican colleagues' rhetoric has frightened a whole generation of American people to such an extent that they fear it will not be there when they retire. I am one of them. But the Democratic plan will keep our economic engine running and competitive while maintaining fiscal discipline, and ensuring that social security and Medicare will absolutely be there to protect every American family.

Republicans want to leave over 45 million middle class families out in the cold with their tax cuts for the wealthy, with their tax plan. But the average annual cut for 60 percent of regular American taxpayers would be a measly \$100. Compare that to \$20,000 for those earning over \$300,000 and we will see who will be shortchanged.

The Republican tax cut plan is unfair. Let us use the surplus for everyone.

THE SURPLUS SHOULD BE SPENT IN PAYING DOWN THE NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, there is a lot of talk about the surplus. Everybody has ideas on how to spend the surplus. Fortunately, saving social security is high on every list, as well as tax cuts.

There is another necessity, paying down the national debt. We do not hear much about paying down the national debt. It is a lot more fun to spend money. But the interest on the present debt is \$300 billion a year. As we pay down the debt, interest payments will decrease, which means more money for the real needs of government.

Let us put paying down the debt high on our priority list.

DEMOCRAT PLAN WILL SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND PROVIDE TARGETED TAX CUTS TO MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, for the first time in three decades the Federal Government has a surplus. The debate: what to do with it. Today Democrats want to use the historic \$70 billion surplus to save social security, save Medicare, and to provide targeted tax cuts to middle class families.

Republicans want to give a one-time tax break that mostly benefits the

wealthy. The Republican tax plan is unfair and it is ill-advised. A 10 percent tax cut is a plan that is skewed to the wealthy. If Republicans get their way, 60 percent of Americans, the middle class backbone of this country, will get a tax rebate of only \$100, while the wealthy, those making over \$300,000, will get a \$20,000 tax break.

Let us take this opportunity to help people. Let us save social security and Medicare. Let us look at those targeted tax cuts, like a tax cut for long-term health care, school modernization, child care, for stay-at-home parents, those that directly benefit working middle class families. Let us not squander this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

LET US KEEP OUR SENIOR CITIZENS FROM POVERTY AND SUPPORT SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, before the implementation of social security, so many of our senior citizens in America simply died in poverty. Let me make myself perfectly clear. Before we had social security, so many of our senior citizens died in poverty. Yet, our Republican friends choose to give away tax dollars, if you will, without realizing the importance of saving social security as the most successful anti-poverty legislation ever passed into law by Congress.

Social security is not broken. For millions of Americans, it is the only means of sustenance that is available to them. For millions of others, it is a necessary supplement to their pension plans and retirement funds. Without social security, I have no doubt that the life of older Americans and the disabled will be stark and unforgiving.

That is why we must reinvest our budget surplus into social security, to make sure they will be there for our future. Under the President's budget for the next fiscal year, we will take 62 percent of our budget surplus and put it back into social security, helping extend the life of the program decades beyond 2032.

Madam Speaker, let us take our senior citizens out of poverty and support the continuation of social security.

THE PRESIDENT CANNOT HAVE IT BOTH WAYS

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last year in the President's proposed budget, he proposed saving all surpluses in the future for social security. Then he went on in his proposal and had enough new spending to eliminate all surpluses.

The President cannot have it both ways. This year he is proposing 62 percent of future surpluses for social security, and everybody is applauding that;

15 percent of surpluses to save Medicare, and many are applauding that. Then he went on with a spending plan that would take 75 to 80 percent of proposed surpluses and spend them.

When we add that up, that is 150 to 160 percent. The President cannot have it both ways. If he is serious about saving social security and Medicare, he cannot have all of these new spending programs that will eliminate all surpluses that will allow us to fix social security and Medicare.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken later in the day.

EXTENDING THE AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 98) to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 98

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "March 31, 1999" and inserting "December 31, 2003".

SEC. 2. CENTENNIAL OF FLIGHT COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Section 4(a)(5) of the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143 note; 112 Stat. 3487) is amended by inserting ", or his designee," after "prominence".

(2) STATUS.—Section 4 of such Act (112 Stat. 3487) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) STATUS.—The members of the Commission described in paragraphs (1), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a) shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the United States."

(b) DUTIES.—Section 5(a)(7) of such Act (112 Stat. 3488) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) as a nonprimary purpose, publish popular and scholarly works related to the his-

tory of aviation or the anniversary of the centennial of powered flight."

(c) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Section 6 of such Act (112 Stat. 3488–3489) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—At its second business meeting, the Commission shall adopt a policy to protect against possible conflicts of interest involving its members and employees. The Commission shall consult with the Office of Government Ethics in the development of such a policy and shall recognize the status accorded its members under section 4(g)."

(d) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The first sentence of section 7(a) of such Act (112 Stat. 3489) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "or represented on the First Flight Centennial Advisory Board under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 12(b)(1)."

(e) EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, LOGOS, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND MARKS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 9(d) of such Act (112 Stat. 3490) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", except that the Commission may transfer any portion of such funds that is in excess of the funds necessary to carry out such duties to any Federal agency or the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution to be used for the sole purpose of commemorating the history of aviation or the centennial of powered flight."

(2) DUTIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA.—Section 9 of such Act (112 Stat. 3490) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) DUTIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA.—The duties of the Commission under this section shall be carried out by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the Commission."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in the last Congress the war risk insurance program was reauthorized only through March 31 of this year, so we must move quickly to reauthorize a program which has been operating successfully for over 47 years. This bill would reauthorize the war risk insurance program through December 31, 2003.

It is essential that we do this because commercial insurance companies usually will not insure flights into high-risk areas, such as countries at war or on the verge of war. In many cases, the flights into these dangerous situations are required to further United States' foreign policy or national security objectives.

Commercial airlines have been used in such operations as Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and other conflicts to ferry troops and equipment. Without this war risk program, the commercial airlines would not have flown these dangerous military flights.

In addition, the provision has been added that amends the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act as passed last year. This provision is a technical

amendment that corrects deficiencies in the act. The provision cures minor technical deficiencies in the war risk insurance program. It is indeed a very important part of our military support system, and I strongly urge passage of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 98, a bill to extend the Department of Transportation's aviation war risk insurance program. The war risk insurance program, which was created in 1951, has operated successfully to serve the foreign policy interests of the United States during the difficult times of war.

Commercial insurance companies usually will not insure commercial airline flights to high-risk areas, such as countries at war or on the verge of war. The aviation war risk insurance program provides insurance to commercial airlines for such high-risk flights, which are often needed for national security reasons.

For example, commercial air carriers have transported U.S. troops and supplies during the Vietnam War, the Persian Gulf War, and most recently, the deployment in Bosnia. In fact, since 1975, there have been over 5,000 flights covered by the war risk insurance program.

The bill we are considering today under suspension of the rules, H.R. 98, is a bill to extend the war risk insurance program for 5 years through the year 2003. This is truly a noncontroversial bill. Congress has routinely reauthorized the war risk insurance program in the past.

The Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 includes a reauthorization of the war risk insurance program, and even modified the program to ensure prompt payment to the airlines in the event of a crash. Unfortunately, the omnibus bill only authorized the war risk insurance program through March 31, 1999.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill to authorize the war risk insurance program through the year 2003. We cannot afford to let this program expire. The war risk insurance program has protected U.S. national security interests by addressing the high-risk insurance needs of commercial airlines.

Without the war risk insurance program in place, commercial airlines will not be able to get insurance for high-risk flights and would be reluctant to fly into high-risk areas, even though it would be in the interests of U.S. foreign policy and national security needs.

H.R. 98 has the bipartisan support of the Committee on Transportation and infrastructure. As an original cosponsor of the bill, I again strongly urge my colleagues to support it. The war risk

insurance program has proved its outstanding value and deserves our prompt attention.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), our outstanding chairman, for yielding me this time.

As has been explained, this bill, H.R. 98, will reauthorize the war risk insurance program through December of the year 2003. We rarely hear about this important program, Madam Speaker, until a conflict arises such as the Gulf War or Bosnia, or when its authorization expires.

However, the war risk insurance program is essential to the safety and security needs of our Nation. No airline will provide air service if its planes are not insured. Commercial insurance policies contain a provision stating that aircraft will not be covered if the aircraft flies into a war zone.

The war risk insurance program provides insurance for commercial airlines to provide flights to high-risk areas. These flights are usually requested by our government agencies for services such as ferrying troops and supplies. With this insurance, commercial airlines are willing to take on these dangerous missions. Without this insurance, a key piece of our national security program is missing.

The program is due to expire in March of this year. It is essential that we authorize this program to protect our Nation in times of need. This program has covered thousands and thousands of flights into war zones, and it is very, very necessary.

In addition, Madam Speaker, we have a technical provision that has been added to this bill at the request of our friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). This technical correction corrects deficiencies in the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act. This act was passed last Congress to establish a commission to assist in the commemoration of the centennial of powered flight and the achievements of the Wright Brothers. The added provision simply clarifies certain provisions of the bill, such as conflicts of interest, appointment of members, and defines certain nonprimary purposes of the commission.

Due to the nature of this provision and the importance of the war risk insurance program, I strongly support this bill, and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1100

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time. I also rise in strong support of H.R. 98 to extend the War Risk Insurance Program.

The years when I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation, and prior to that the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, we held extensive hearings on the subject of war risk insurance and the significance that it played in our national defense effort.

It was clear that those who initiated this unique form of insurance in the early 1950s had a clear vision of what this country needed and how our Nation's air carriers, though small in number comparatively in 1951, could play a significant role in our national defense effort.

Today with a domestic fleet of well over 4,500 commercial aircraft, and probably 1,000 of those or so capable of international service, war risk insurance adds to our national military airlift capability, particularly those aircraft that are outfitted, that are especially adapted for the Civil Reserve Air Fleet Program with internal strengthening that allows those aircraft to carry heavier and more significant payloads of equipment as well as personnel.

What the War Risk Insurance Program has meant for our military operations in far-flown parts of the globe is perhaps best highlighted by Operation Desert Storm in Kuwait and Iraq, when our domestic carriers flew some 5,000 missions into hostile territory.

Without war risk insurance, those carriers would not have undertaken those flights. They would not have provided the service of bringing personnel and equipment faster than we could have done with only the Military Airlift Command of the U.S. military services.

There is another element, though, of this War Risk Insurance Program that is so important. We loaded up U.S. carriers with equipment and especially personnel to fly them into either Saudi Arabia or into Kuwait during the months of Operation Desert Storm. But those aircraft then had to come back empty because they could not fly commercial passengers out of a hostile zone.

Meanwhile, their competitors, other airlines of the Middle East region and European carriers, were flying loads into Europe or into the Middle East and flying passengers back to the United States that our carriers were not able to carry. So our carriers suffered a competitive, in effect, penalty for providing a great national service.

If we did not have war risk insurance, those carriers would not have operated. They would have lost both ways. So I really feel very strongly about continuing this service.

I think there are adjustments that need to be made for the benefit of domestic carriers when they are operating in hostile territory. This is not the bill. This is not the time to do it. But

it is something where we need to look longer out into the future and to better serve the interests of U.S. carriers as they serve our national flag in time of national emergency.

Meanwhile, continuation of this program is vital. If we extend it only till March 31 of this year, with continuing hostility in the Persian Gulf, clearly the service of domestic carriers will be needed again.

We cannot allow this program to expire. I think the House should act today. The Senate should act promptly. The President ought to sign the bill into law and allow this program to continue serving the national interest as it has done so well for over 40 years.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 98, the War Risk Insurance Program Extension;

I wish to express my appreciation for the hard work of Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN, and Subcommittee Ranking Member LIPINSKI in crafting this legislation and getting it to the floor in an expeditious manner;

This bill is highly important, especially when U.S. troops are still being deployed to various parts of the world;

Commercial insurance companies usually do not insure commercial airline flights to high risk areas;

To ensure that flights to high risk areas can operate when needed, Chapter 443 of Title 49 of the U.S. Code authorized the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance to commercial airlines against any risks;

The program has been reauthorized 12 times and is now scheduled to reexpire on March 31, 1999;

This bill is a simple, non-controversial reauthorization for the program through December 2003;

Many members of the U.S. military, both active and reserve, live in California's 41st Congressional District;

When called upon to go overseas, they usually use March Air Reserve Base, located near my district, as a staging point for deployment;

Commercial carriers are sometimes called upon to provide Boeing 747s and other wide bodied jets for such operations;

We saw this clearly happen during Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm;

Passing the War Risk Insurance Program will allow these high risk flights to operate as needed;

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 98 by unanimous consent.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the authorization of the War Risk Insurance program is one of the first pieces of legislation this Congress will consider. The War Risk Insurance Program is crucial to our aviation transportation system. Just like aircraft insurance is essential to any typical commercial domestic or international carrier, aircraft is also a necessity for flights to high-risk areas. Unfortunately, the private insurance market will often not insure flights to high-risk areas such as to countries at war. As such, in the interest of national security, it is critical the government provide insurance for carriers that must fly to unstable areas.

Since 1975, there have been 5,000 flights covered by the program. During Operation

Desert Shield and Desert Storm commercial airlines were needed to ferry troops and equipment to the Middle East. The war risk insurance fund has grown to over \$70 million. We must ensure the solvency of this program in times of conflict. I am pleased we are taking swift and appropriate action to authorize this program before it expires on March 31. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 98.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, once again I ask everyone to support this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 98, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SHORT-TERM EXTENSION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 31 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 31

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 99) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend Federal Aviation Administration programs through September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII or section 302(f) or section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or section 302(f) or section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are

waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my very good friend, and say I am very happy to see him here, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time that I will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me first begin here by commending both the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, for their cooperation in making this first rule of the 106th Congress an open rule that will permit consideration of an important piece of legislation.

Specifically, this resolution makes in order H.R. 99, providing for the temporary extension of Federal Aviation Administration programs under, as I said, an open rule providing for one hour of general debate.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1. The rule also contains several waivers that are necessary for the bill to be considered today.

The waivers of sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act are necessary because Congress did not adopt the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution and, pursuant to House Resolution 5, fiscal year 1999 budget alloca-

tions have not been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, the waiver of clause 7 of rule XVI is necessary because Title II of the amendment in the nature of a substitute was not part of the introduced bill. Title II is language for the Committee on Ways and Means that allows expenditures from the Aviation Trust Fund.

Finally, the waiver of clause 4(a) of rule XIII is needed because the report on H.R. 99 was not filed by the Committee of Transportation and Infrastructure until yesterday.

Members who preprinted their amendments in the RECORD prior to their consideration will be given priority and recognition. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is authorized to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, last year the House passed a very comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill, but there was not enough time to work through a conference with the other body. As a result, the omnibus appropriations bill passed last year contained only a 6-month extension of the FAA's Airport Improvement Program. That short-term extension expires on March 31 of this year.

In order to give the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the full House time to develop a comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill this year, we need to extend the 6-month short-term authorization through the rest of this fiscal year. Without passage of H.R. 99, no new Airport Improvement Program grants can be issued after March 31. AIP grants fund a variety of airport safety and capacity-enhancing projects such as runway extensions, taxiway construction, and noise abatement projects. As more and more people fly every day, it is important to maintain the highest safety standards at our Nation's airports.

I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) plans to bring to the House a comprehensive aviation reform bill later this year that will address many very important and complex issues. Those issues may range from whether to increase the number of airport slots at busy airports, to what kind of passenger protection provisions should be included, to how the Aviation Trust Fund should be handled. These complex issues cannot be fully addressed before the current AIP reauthorization expires. Passage of H.R. 99 provides Congress with enough time to produce a comprehensive aviation reform bill.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this very fair, balanced, and open rule and also the bipartisan FAA reauthorization legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my dear friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Madam Speaker, I want to publicly congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my chairman, my dear friend, for bringing this totally open rule to the floor. May every one of his rules be as open as this, Madam Speaker. It is a great, great start.

Madam Speaker, last year the House passed a bill to improve our airports. Unfortunately, the Senate did not pass a similar bill. If we do not pass this bill, the Federal Aviation Administration will not be able to issue grants after March 31 of this year.

That will mean, Madam Speaker, that the much-needed airport construction that is already under way will have to stop, and the new expansion and improvement of programs will just not get off the ground.

Madam Speaker, according to the Air Transport Association, the United States had 605 million airline passengers in 1997. In 1998 we had about 2 million passengers a day. In the next 10 years, Madam Speaker, that number is expected to increase to 1 billion people flying in and out of our airports each year.

The airline delays in this country's 18,000 airports cost the airline industry about \$2.5 billion each and every year. Most of that ends up as ticket costs for consumers.

In 1997 the U.S. airlines placed orders and options for orders for nearly 1,400 new aircraft. That is a lot more planes and a lot more congestion. It is estimated that it will cost about \$8 billion a year to pay for our airport development needs caused in part by these new planes.

□ 1115

Madam Speaker, many of our airports are just not equipped to handle the growing crowds. As anyone who has faced a late airplane or an overcrowded airport can tell us, our airports need work. They need a lot of work.

We need to get our airport safety systems up to date. We need to make our airports bigger. We need to update our traffic control systems. This bill will make all that happen.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues tell me that the House will take up the regular FAA improvement bill later this year, but we need to pass this temporary bill today in order to make sure construction proceeds in the interim. Otherwise, Madam Speaker, we will miss the construction season and delay these long overdue improvements even further.

Madam Speaker, there is very little opposition to this bill. It was reported out of committee by a voice vote.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very, very open rule and the accompanying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the very energetic, hardworking and peripatetic chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who is eager to address this issue.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the powerful chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time. I will limit my gratitude until I look up the word "peripatetic." I may or may not amplify that. In any event, it is a pleasure to be here with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) who is a longtime friend and a great legislator, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) who is also a longtime friend and a great legislator.

Madam Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 99, a bill to extend the authorization for certain Federal Aviation Administration programs for 6 months, through September 30, 1999. However, I want to stress my support for H.R. 99 extends only to the bill as currently drafted.

My concern is that if H.R. 99 passes the House, it might become a vehicle to go to conference on a much broader bill from the other body. If that were to happen, many important aviation issues, including the addition of slots to the four slot-controlled airports, might come back in a conference report without any opportunity for House amendments. I have raised this concern with the Speaker, the majority leader and the majority whip. It is my understanding they will not allow H.R. 99 to become a vehicle for such a broader conference. With that understanding, I am certainly willing to support H.R. 99 so that the FAA's authorization will not expire at the end of March. Let me conclude by saying that I appreciate the cooperation of each of our three leaders in clarifying this matter so this important legislation can move forward.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I urge support of this rule.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 31 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 99.

□ 1119

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 99) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend Federal Aviation Administration programs through September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation. It is a very simple bill which extends the Airport Improvement Program because it was reauthorized for only 6 months last year. As a result, the FAA's Airport Improvement Program funding is set to expire on March 31. If that were to happen, there would be no funds available for very, very important airport safety and capacity improvement projects, such as runway extensions and taxiway constructions. Already aviation delays cost the industry billions of dollars. In fact, in 1997 delays cost the carriers \$2.4 billion which, of course, gets translated into costs that are imposed ultimately upon the traveling public and the aviation passengers. So it is very important that this legislation, this simple extension, be passed.

We indeed do intend to bring to the floor major legislation later in the year. That is not what we have here today. All we have here today is a simple extension. I would point out that the AIP contract authority authorized by this legislation is fully consistent with the CBO baseline for this program as well as the 6-month contract authority established in last year's omnibus appropriations bill. I would strongly urge support for this important legislation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in urging swift passage of H.R. 99, and I want to compliment him for making this the top issue of the committee's agenda in this Congress. He rightly saw at the conclusion of the 105th Congress that, as we dealt so masterfully under his gifted and vigorous leadership with the surface transportation needs of this country, that our next focus had to be the Nation's airways and airports. This simple 6-month extension is, in a sense, a down payment on the committee's commitment at the end of the last session and the beginning of this to address vigorously and in a broad, visionary concept the Nation's aviation requirements.

I compliment the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for

the leadership and vigor they have put forth in bringing this bill to the floor and on the preparation that has gone into the subsequent legislation that we will consider. While the number 99 is rather fortuitous, just quite by accident the bill carries the number H.R. 99, it is symbolic, and it is, I think, a wonderful gesture that the very first aviation bill we bring to the floor carries the name of the oldest organization of women aviators, the 99s, formed in the late 1920s.

In bringing this bill to the floor, we in this, I think, very special way pay a tribute to women who have contributed so much to the growth of aviation and development of aviation in this country and perhaps suggest to the commercial airlines of the United States that they make as much room in the flight deck for women as general aviation has made room for women in that sector. Perhaps with this bill we can use the encouragement of the committee to advance the cause of careers for women in aviation.

At the close of the last session, it was a disappointment to our committee that we were not able to reach an agreement with the other body on a long-term reauthorization of the Airport Improvement Program and all other aspects of aviation. We had hoped to reach an agreement, but numerous obstacles, including the one cited by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) just moments ago during consideration of the rule proved to be problems. So we bring to the House floor a very simple 6-month extension. But, as I said, it is a downpayment. It ensures, and I urge the other body to act quickly on this legislation, it ensures that after March 31 with signature of this bill into law, the funding for the FAA airport improvement grant program will be able to continue, that the investment plans of the Nation's airports will carry forward. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Illinois and I share this concern representing northern tier States. If we do not provide for the continued funding of the AIP program, surely contracts will be slowed down, airport projects in northern tier States will be slowed down. We cannot afford that. We have a very limited construction season. We need these projects to move ahead as quickly as possible. That is why this legislation is so vitally important.

Furthermore, I think we have to look at the broader picture of aviation and the significant impact of aviation on our national economy. It represents a \$600 billion sector of our \$7 trillion domestic economy. That is about 8 percent of our domestic economy that is driven directly by aviation. We can get multiples if we took secondary impacts. There are 1.5 million jobs just in the United States alone with a \$100 billion payroll. But worldwide, the impact of air transport is in the range of \$1.5 trillion. That is growing at a rate of 6 and 7 percent a year in international

trade and passengers and cargo. Those economic gains, though, will be slowed down and the potential of aviation economic contribution to the domestic and international economy will be slowed down if we do not have the vision to pass this legislation and the broader bill that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the committee will bring to the floor in the next few months.

Congestion and weather are the two biggest enemies of efficient air travel. Weather is a factor in over half of the congestion cases that we experience in the course of a year. But inadequate infrastructure is the other contributing factor. Often these two issues converge. If we take an airport like Newark that has only a 950-foot separation between its two main runways, in worst weather conditions they can operate only one runway. If they had full separation of the required minimum mile between the two runways, even in the worst weather conditions they could operate both runways to the maximum possible permitted by their combination of air traffic control equipment and the ability to keep runway surfaces clear in snow and other conditions, icy conditions. But with runways that close together, they have to shut down one of them in worst weather conditions.

There are many other airports across this country that face the same problem. As we extend runways and widen the separation between runways, build more hard air side capacity, we increase the ability of our airports to serve the needs of airlines and air travelers.

In 1987, a year in which I chaired the oversight committee and held hearings on aviation capacity, the FAA estimated to our committee that there were 21 airports with delays of 20,000 hours a year and more. By 10 years later, within a decade, there were 27 such airports with 20 to 50,000 hours of delay a year. What does that mean to the airlines and to air travelers? Well, Delta Airlines cited traffic inefficiencies costing that carrier \$360 million a year.

□ 1130

It adds up to several billions of dollars of cost to the airlines and to air travelers when they cannot reach their destinations in time or they get there and the gates are crowded, the aircraft cannot park at the gate. We have to respond to that situation.

The National Civil Aviation Review Commission found that, quote, although 19 out of 20 of the busiest airports in the world are in the United States, this Nation can no longer claim that it has the world's most modern air traffic control system.

The second aspect of aviation is the technology to increase capacity and make carrier movements more efficient. This legislation continues funding of the air traffic control technology side of aviation to improve capacity at the Nation's airports.

The hard fact is, though, that we are not meeting the on-the-ground requirements of runway extension, runway addition, taxiways and gate capacity at our Nation's airports.

According to GAO, even with the AIP funds included in this bill we are falling short of the airport capacity capital requirements of this country by as much as \$3 billion a year. That is why we need to pass this bill now, give ourselves a little time to craft larger, broader legislation that will deal over the next decade with the capacity requirements of our Nation's airports and air travelers.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, last year, as has been pointed out by some of the previous speakers, a comprehensive FAA reauthorization package, H.R. 4057, passed the House and a companion bill was passed in the Senate.

Unfortunately, conference negotiations broke down and only a short-term six-month extension for the airport improvement program was passed as part of the omnibus appropriations bill.

This bill, H.R. 99, would extend the FAA's airport improvement program and fund the FAA's operations and facilities equipment programs through the end of fiscal year 1999. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has already explained the great importance of these programs, especially at a time of such rapid growth in both commercial passenger traffic and air cargo traffic.

Last year, we carried for the first time in history with not a single fatality, a single commercial air fatality, 615 million passengers. This year, that figure is scheduled to go up to 660 million and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pointed out, to over a billion at some point in the very near future, certainly within the next decade.

With the passage of this bill, \$10.3 billion for the FAA's program would be authorized for 1999. Also at the request of the House Committee on Ways and Means, we have added a provision to extend the general expenditure authority for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. We are also planning to introduce a long-term comprehensive reauthorization bill, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has pointed out, in conjunction with our attempt to take the trust fund off budget in H.R. 111.

In the comprehensive bill, we will attempt to take care of many of the requests we receive each year from Members concerning airport and aviation

needs. However, since AIP funding will expire as of March 31st, it is very important to pass H.R. 99 to extend this funding at least through the end of year, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Aviation.

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, first of all, I want to say that I am sure that this year will be very interesting, very exciting and very productive for aviation in this Nation. I am sure behind the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), that we will solve all the problems of aviation in this Nation and probably solve a few of them that extend beyond our boundaries.

Getting down to the specific legislation, which I rise in strong support of, H.R. 99, the AIP program is vital to airports of all sizes throughout the Nation. The AIP program provides grants to fund needed safety, security, capacity, in noise projects. Without H.R. 99, important airport projects will be disrupted and delayed.

For example, Midway Airport, which is located in my Congressional district, and which I consider to be the number one airport in all of Chicagoland, is beginning a multiyear, \$722 million terminal development program, \$138 million of which will be provided by the FAA's AIP program.

If the AIP program expires, Midway Airport will have to rely on other sources such as the PFC and rates and charges to fund the current phase of the terminal project which, more than likely, will increase costs for the future users of the terminal. In addition, the City of Chicago's Department of Aviation relies on the AIP program to fund noise mitigation projects. If the AIP program expires, schools around both O'Hare Airport and Midway Airport will have to wait another full year for badly needed sound insulation.

H.R. 99 is also needed to ensure that the AIP program receives the full \$1.95 billion provided by the Omnibus Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1999. The omnibus bill provided \$1.95 billion for the AIP program for fiscal year 1999. However, it also limited the amount of the AIP program that could actually be spent before March 31, 1999, to \$975 million. The AIP program will be entitled to the full appropriated amount of \$1.95 billion only if H.R. 99 is passed and the AIP program is authorized through the end of the fiscal year.

With the capital needs of airports estimated to be about \$10 billion per year, we cannot afford to cut funding for the AIP program in half. If we do not pass H.R. 99, we will, in effect, cut funding for the AIP program in half for fiscal 1999.

Consequently, once again I rise in strong support along with the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) on behalf of H.R. 99.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I insert for the RECORD the correspondence between the House Committee on Ways and Means and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure regarding title II of the bill:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1999.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: I understand that on Thursday, January 6, 1999, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure approved H.R. 99, a bill providing for a 6-month extension of Federal Aviation Administration programs.

As you know, the Trust Fund Code includes specific provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means which govern trust fund expenditure authority and which limit purposes for which trust fund moneys may be spent. Statutorily, the Committee on Ways and Means generally has limited expenditures by cross-referencing provisions of authorizing legislation. Currently, the Trust Fund Code provisions allow expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund before October 1, 1998. Similarly, the Trust Fund Code approves all expenditures from the Airport and Airway trust fund permitted under previously enacted authorization Acts, most recently the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996, as in effect on the date of enactment of the 1996 Act.

I now understand that you are seeking to have H.R. 99 considered by the House as early as the first week in February. In addition, I have been informed that your Committee will seek a Manager's or Committee amendment to the bill which will include language I am supplying (attached) to address the necessary trust fund provisions. The amendment would extend until October 1, 1999, the general expenditure authority for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, would update the expenditure purposes of the Trust Fund, and would provide that, generally, expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund may occur only as provided in the Internal Revenue Code.

Based on this understanding, and in order to expedite consideration of this legislation, it will not be necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means to markup this legislation. This is being done with the further understanding that the Committee will be treated without prejudice as to its jurisdictional prerogatives on such or similar provisions in the future, and it should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means in the future.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 99, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be placed in the Record during consideration of the bill on the Floor. Thank

you for your cooperation and assistance on this matter. With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from Airport and Airway Trust Fund) is amended—

(1) by striking "October 1, 1998" and inserting "October 1, 1999", and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) the following: "or the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 or the Airport Improvement Program Short-Term Extension Act of 1999".

(b) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.—Section 9502 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no amount may be appropriated or credited to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund on and after the date of any expenditure from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund which is not permitted by this section. The determination of whether an expenditure is so permitted shall be made without regard to—

"(A) any provision of law which is not contained or referenced in this title or in a revenue Act, and

"(B) whether such provision of law is a subsequently enacted provision or directly or indirectly seeks to waive the application of this subsection.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR PRIOR OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure to liquidate any contract entered into (or for any amount otherwise obligated) before October 1, 1999, in accordance with the provisions of this section."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, February 1, 1999.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL, Thank you for your recent letter regarding the bill, H.R. 99, providing for an extension of programs of the Federal Aviation Administration through the end of Fiscal Year 1999. You are correct that we are drafting a Manager's amendment for the House Floor debate. I appreciate your willingness to have us include in this amendment the necessary changes to the Trust Fund Code which governs trust fund expenditure authority. The amendment would extend until October 1, 1999, the general expenditure authority for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, would update the expenditure purposes of the Trust Fund, and would provide that, generally, expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund may occur only as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. Attached is the amendment we plan to offer on the House Floor.

To accelerate the consideration of H.R. 99 on the House Floor, I appreciate your willingness to forego marking up this legislation in the Ways and Means Committee. Of course, I understand that your action under these circumstances should not affect the Ways and Means Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar provisions in the future.

As you requested, I will be including a copy of your letter, and my reply in the RECORD during consideration of the bill on the Floor. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter.

With warm regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 99, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Airport Improvement Program Short-Term Extension Act of 1999".

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$1,205,000,000" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "\$2,410,000,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1999."

(b) OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) is amended by striking "March 31, 1999" and inserting "September 30, 1999".

SEC. 102. AIRWAY FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) \$2,131,000,000 for fiscal year 1999."

SEC. 103. FAA OPERATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM GENERAL FUND.—Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$5,158,000,000" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "\$5,632,000,000 for fiscal year 1999."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM TRUST FUND.—Section 48104(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking "FISCAL YEARS 1994-1998" and inserting "FISCAL YEARS 1994-2000"; and

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "through 1998" and inserting "through 2000".

(c) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATING OR EXPENDING AMOUNTS.—Section 48108(c) of such title is amended by striking "1998" and inserting "2000".

SEC. 104. AIP DISCRETIONARY FUND.

Section 47115 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from Airport and Airway Trust Fund) is amended—

(1) by striking "October 1, 1998" and inserting "October 1, 1999"; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) the following: "or the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 or the Airport Improvement Program Short-Term Extension Act of 1999".

(b) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.—Section 9502 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no amount may be appropriated or credited to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund on and after the date of any expenditure from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund which is not permitted by this section. The determination of whether an expenditure is so permitted shall be made without regard to—

"(A) any provision of law which is not contained or referenced in this title or in a revenue Act, and

"(B) whether such provision of law is a subsequently enacted provision or directly or indirectly seeks to waive the application of this subsection.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR PRIOR OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure to liquidate any contract entered into (or for any amount otherwise obligated) before October 1, 1999, in accordance with the provisions of this section."

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, this bill is absolutely essential. The first portion, to extend the AIP program, is extremely important to local airports which are in the midst of planning and construction cycles. Since the current authorization expires in less than 60 days, if we do not pass this bill, these airports will be at a loss as to what to do and how to proceed. Airports have received only half of their normal grant money for this year, and if we do not pass this bill, they will not receive the remainder. Furthermore, since airport construction projects are unique and long-term, this shortfall will create serious problems for airport planners who have to schedule these projects in phases.

Beyond that, this bill gives us time to begin a larger debate about making sure that America's airport infrastructure and aviation systems are the best in the world. At this point, although I believe they are very good, they are slipping compared to the rest of the world. The debate about airport funding, safety, security and the aviation industry as a whole needs to start with this legislation.

Let me speak about one area in particular that I am acquainted with, and that is acquiring computers and planning the software and hardware for the new air traffic control system. In a very interesting study several years ago, then-Senator Cohen, who is currently Secretary of Defense, came to the startling realization that the present procurement policies for the Federal Government absolutely guarantee that every computer the Federal Government will buy is obsolete at the time it is purchased.

Now how is this possible? Because in the time it takes to go through the specifications procedure, the actual procurement and purchase procedure and follow all the required Federal guidelines, roughly two years will have elapsed—more likely three years. As everyone knows, according to Moore's

law, computer speed doubles every 18 months, and it is generally acknowledged that after three years computers have lost their usefulness in the industrial realm. Although people may continue to use them longer, they are no longer optimizing their investment, and if it takes us three years to decide which computer to buy and then buy it, we are always buying obsolete computers.

We have tried to correct that in the case of the FAA a few years back by giving them more leeway in the procurement process, but it is still not enough. What FAA has done to try to get around this is to keep changing the specifications as they go along to ensure that they will have up-to-date computers and will have the advanced software needed to manage the new air traffic control system, the so-called free-flight system. It is not working very well, it is not working very efficiently, and I do not blame the FAA for this; I blame the requirements that are imposed on this agency, being subject to the requirements that all Federal agencies have to meet.

But we are struggling here with a situation where this is a rapidly evolving field, the airlines are progressing very rapidly, the air traffic control system must evolve as rapidly, and we must develop the best hardware and the best software to handle the complex air traffic control system of the future. We cannot do that under the current authorization, and I hope when we complete the extension of reauthorizing the FAA in this bill, that then we will have a good bill ready that will allow us to address all these handicaps, that will allow us to develop an air traffic control system and an FAA that is second to none in the world, that will indeed match the performance of our airlines and will match the performance that we expect from any agency that is regulating various industries. Then we will be a help and not a hindrance to the airline industry.

Once again I want everyone to understand clearly I am not castigating the current FAA administrator. She is doing a marvelous job. I am not castigating her staff. I am simply saying that we have to change the rules of the game and give them the flexibility they need. We made a great step a few years ago. We have to go further, and I hope, as we rewrite this bill, we will be able to do that.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from the State of my birth, Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important statement, and I hope that Members are paying careful attention to the observations of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) about the complexities of contracting in the FAA for the requirements of our air traffic control system.

It is an issue that our former colleague, Mr. Clinger, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I worked on for many years, and with the gentleman's help, bringing his able scientific physics background to bear on this issue of keeping ahead of the technology, and impeded as we were, as the FAA is, by ancient contracting rules that were devised during the Civil War era for buying mules for the U.S. Army, still in place for acquiring air traffic control computer equipment. As the gentleman has observed, we need to simplify that process. Let us bend every effort as we proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

□ 1145

We will do this as we proceed with the broader authorization bill to make every effort to address that issue and to help the FAA complete its task of modernization of the air traffic control system. I thank the gentleman for raising this very important subject.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and would agree that computers change much more rapidly than mules. We must make sure that we have a top-flight system in operation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding me this time. I am not a member of the committee, but I have been long supportive of the work of the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in assuring a sound transportation infrastructure for our Nation. It is vital, not only to our Nation's present quality of life, but to the quality of life for our children.

I rise today in support of H.R. 99, but I would like to spend my moments here, if I might, talking about aircraft noise.

Aircraft engines make a lot of noise. They are loud, droning, and, in some cases, unbearable to be near. People living in major metropolitan areas where there are often several airports nearby have to live with this oppressive aircraft noise. It has an extremely negative impact on the quality of their lives and on their health.

In an attempt to address this problem, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 was enacted. This law requires jet aircraft to be equipped with newer technology, quieter Stage 3 engines by December 31, 1999. It ends the operation of the older, noisier, Stage 2 and Stage 1 aircraft engines.

As a result of that law, major commercial airliners have already phased out most of their Stage 2 and Stage 1 aircraft. But, unfortunately, the law exempted aircraft weighing less than 75,000 pounds.

Planes weighing less than 75,000 pounds are typically general aviation aircraft. However, even though these general aviation aircraft are smaller than commercial airliners, in most cases they are louder than commercial airliners, because most of them are still equipped with the Stage 2 or Stage 1 engines.

Therefore, air noise problems in our most densely populated areas in the United States will not go away unless we have an across-the-board elimination of Stage 2 and Stage 1 aircraft engines, including engines of all general aviation aircraft.

Let me give you an example. At Teterboro Airport, in New Jersey, in my district, Teterboro Airport has roughly 15 percent of the aircraft using Teterboro with the Stage 1 or Stage 2 aircraft, only 15 percent, but that 15 percent of Stage 1 and Stage 2 aircraft account for 90 percent, 90 percent, of all the aircraft noise violations at the airport.

So, the solution: I am introducing the Aircraft Noise Reduction Act of 1999, which will close this loophole and prohibit the operation of all older, louder, Stage 1 and Stage 2 aircraft engines in the 20 largest metropolitan areas with the worst air-noise problems.

In heavy aircraft traffic areas, like New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Dallas, Houston, Miami, Seattle, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Phoenix, San Diego, St. Louis, Pittsburgh and Denver, the residents surrounding these airports are being continuously pounded with aircraft noise and they are demanding action. They need relief from aircraft noise now, and we must give them that relief now.

This legislation achieves a balance, the need for the aircraft noise relief for these residents living in our Nation's most congested areas, with the legitimate economic needs of small aircraft operators who need to land in smaller airports away from our Nation's largest cities.

I am hopeful that the leaders of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Subcommittee on Aviation will work with me to see that this legislation is included in the FAA's reauthorization bill.

I hope my colleagues will work with me to help provide aircraft noise relief, not only to my constituents, but to the millions of Americans all across this country who presently suffer from aircraft noise.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield one minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 99, the FAA Short Term Extension Act. I wish to congratulate the full committee chairman,

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, the Subcommittee on Aviation chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN) and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) in drafting this together on a bipartisan basis.

This bill is extremely important to Ontario International Airport, located in my district. H.R. 99 reauthorizes funding for the Airport Improvement Program through September 31, 1999, and makes several minor changes to FAA programs. Specifically, the measure authorizes \$2.3 billion for the Airport Improvement Program and \$7.8 billion for FAA operations, facilities and equipment.

The bill includes funding for airport improvements, air traffic control facilities and equipment, and the salaries and expenses of operating the FAA.

Finally, H.R. 99 includes funds for new radars, computers and navigation equipment that are needed to modernize the air traffic control system and ensure that air travel remains safe.

I ask my colleagues to pass this bill with their strong support.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a very valuable member of our committee.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bill and to work with us to make this, what we are calling on the committee, the year of aviation. Last year was one of the safest years in American aviation history and I think that this administration, as well as this Congress, should be commended for taking part in this.

We have a lot of work to do this year, not only to maintain our safety record, but also in preparing our aviation system for the challenges of the 21st Century.

In my home state of Florida, aviation is a key part of our economy, which is heavily based on trade and tourism. In the next decade, Miami will handle 35 million passengers, Orlando 30 million, and Jacksonville will continue to be a key intermodal location for aviation, rail and shipping traffic. The grants and programs authorized in this bill, including the airport improvement programs, are critical for the health and safety of aviation in this country.

In addition to supporting this extension, I also support using aviation trust fund dollars for aviation purposes, and I look forward to making this the year of aviation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield two minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Chairman, I rise to commend the Members of the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN), and the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), and to express my appreciation and support for H.R. 99.

My appreciation is enhanced, especially because there are no controversial provisions in this bill to add flights to our Nation's high density airports. There are no provisions to change the perimeter rule at Reagan National Airport. This legislation merely extends funding for the programs under the auspices of the Federal Aviation Administration, including the Airport Improvement Program.

In the Washington area, air service is extremely competitive. Consumers have a choice between three fine airports, and no one airline dominates air service in Washington, as is the case in many major cities.

This high level of competition exists in large part because of the slot and perimeter rules that are in effect at Reagan National Airport. Because of the slot and perimeter rules, the Washington area enjoys twice as many daily flights available from domestic destinations and a wider competitive choice than almost any other area in the country.

Changes in these rules would destroy the environmental and economic balance that exists among Reagan National Airport, Washington Dulles, and Baltimore-Washington International Airport.

The vote and perimeter rules were part of the good faith agreement among Federal, local and airport officials which promoted passage of the 1986 legislation that transferred control of National and Dulles from the FAA to a local authority, MWAA. The provisions have the effect of abating noise, and any changes would have a negative impact on the airport's neighbors in Maryland and Virginia.

Madam Chairman, the slot and perimeter rules are essential to the balance of service to the greater Metropolitan Washington region. I am grateful that H.R. 99 does not make any change to these essential flight limitations.

I urge a yes vote on this important legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in reluctant support of the measure before us today. While I support the goal of the legislation and compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for their

good work in moving expeditiously on this important authorization extension, I fear this measure will undergo substantial and dangerous changes in the other body or during conference.

Madam Chairman, I object to efforts to increase takeoff off and landing slots at existing high density airports, such as La Guardia in my district. As such, I strongly oppose any efforts to add language that would accomplish this goal.

As my colleagues may know, it is an open secret that legislation to increase takeoffs and landings at the Nation's four high density airports will likely be accepted in any conference on the FAA short term extension.

I would strongly encourage the chairman and ranking member not to go outside of the normal legislative process by adding in conference any legislation or proposals that would increase takeoffs and landings at the four high density airports. This is an issue which deserves to be considered separately on its own merits in a full and open debate.

Madam Chairman, increased competition in the airline industry, reduction of fares and expansion of the market to allow small, low fare airlines to compete with larger carriers are all worthy goals that deserve to be fully reviewed. And while I am not opposed to taking steps to increase competition in the airline industry, I cannot support efforts which would do so at the expense of the quality of life of my constituents and others who live and work near high density airports.

My Queens constituency, flanked to the north by La Guardia Airport and to the south by JFK International Airport, live under the most heavily-utilized section of air space in the world. How can this Congress in all good conscience mandate substantial increases in this already heavily burdened area?

Madam Chairman, while my constituents are primarily concerned about the excessive aircraft noise and associated ground traffic at La Guardia that they must deal with each and every day, morning, noon and night, they are also concerned about their safety and that of the traveling public. And in light of a number of near collisions at La Guardia Airport within the past year, it would seem that those concerns are not unwarranted.

Madam Chairman, for Congress to act at this time to mandate the allocation of even more slots at La Guardia and other high density airports would be, I believe, unconscionable. At the very least, the committee should have a full and thorough debate on this issue prior to acting on legislation to increase takeoffs and landings at these airports.

□ 1200

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to acknowledge the concern of the gentleman from New York and our colleague from Illinois who addressed this matter previously during consideration of the rule.

We confronted this issue of slots in the 105th Congress, and we have had extensive discussion about this subject matter, and it is far more complex than appears on its face. The gentleman is right to express his concern that this issue should not be addressed in the context of this short-term extension. I would be vigorously opposed to any attempt to address the matter in the context of this bill, and I hope the gentleman will support the legislation with that understanding.

Certainly the issue of slots at the slot-controlled airports deserves far more extensive consideration than could possibly be given in the context of a short-term extension bill, and I know that the chairman shares that concern. We are not about to let this legislation be sidetracked by an issue of this magnitude, and I urge the gentleman to support our legislation.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of legislation extending Federal Aviation Administration programs an additional six months.

I thank the Chairman and the ranking member for taking quick action to ensure that Federal Aviation Administration programs, and the Airport Improvement Program in particular, will not expire at the end of next month.

I regret, however, that even with enactment of this legislation, two airports that are entitled to receive more than \$20 million in Airport Improvement Program grants will still be unable to receive these funds.

In fact, more than \$200 million in critical construction projects for National and Dulles Airports, funded in part with passenger facility charges (PFCs), are being held hostage pending resolution of the Aviation Competition Act.

At the center of this debate are the rights of one local authority pitted against some members of Congress who want to direct the operations of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

I was prepared to offer an amendment to release these funds and grant approval of the passenger facility charges, but recognize the desire of the Chairman and Ranking member to pass a "clean" FAA reauthorization bill.

I appreciate the Chairman's willingness to listen to the concerns of the members from this region.

I urge the Chairman and Ranking Member to keep the bill "clean" in conference.

I am deeply concerned about provisions in the Senate bill that take us a step back and bring controversy and invite opposition to this important legislation.

I am, of course, referring to provisions about to be considered by the Senate Commerce Committee that would increase the number of flights to the four slot controlled airports.

In the case of National Airport, the Senate legislation would add an additional 24 slots to this congested airport and lift the perimeter rule permitting half of these slots to fly beyond the current 1250 mile perimeter restriction.

Madam Chairman a change in the perimeter rule would result in a cut back in locations presently served by National within the perimeter and adversely affect the development of the Washington region's three commercial airports.

According to studies based on Washington air travel market data produced by the Washington Airports Task Force, every city with

flights to National that generates revenues of less than \$20 million would be vulnerable to service reductions.

Over time, short-range service at National would be displaced and the number of transcontinental flights operating out of Dulles would decline.

As those transcontinental flights decline, Dulles would cease to become an attractive destination for international service.

The growth and development plans overseen by Congress and the substantial investment made at both National and Dulles by the taxpayers, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the aviation community would become substantially devalued.

Madam Chairman, not a day goes by that someone's quality of life is not adversely affected by the constant drum of airplanes taking off and landing at National airport.

For their sake, we should not change the rules they have begrudgingly come to accept.

The balance that has now been struck between the transportation and economic needs of air travelers and the region's environmental concerns was crucial to community acceptance of the redevelopment of National, now nearing completion.

While these communities understand that National is here to stay, they should not be asked to endure additional noise when no compelling public need is served or could be addressed in other ways without altering the slot and perimeter rules.

Congress agreed in 1986 to cede control of National Airport to a regional authority who would have "full power and dominion over, and complete discretion in, operation and development of the Airports."

In return, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Maryland agreed to accept operational control of the airports and raise the money necessary to modernize National and Dulles airports.

Madam Chairman, the two states, the District and the regions' residents have upheld their part of the bargain.

It is time for Congress to honor its part.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 99, the short-term extension of the Federal Aviation Administration. It is critical that we move forward with this bill quickly to ensure that the airport improvement program will continue to receive funding and grants to airports will be honored. In this, the Year of Aviation, we have much to consider and much to accomplish to make our skies even safer and air traffic more efficient and accessible. This short-term reauthorization will give this House and the Senate adequate time to more fully consider longer-term aviation authorization and competition issues. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chairman, I would like to take some time to talk about some of my concerns regarding H.R. 99, the FAA reauthorization legislation. I recognize that this bill funds some very important and critical programs, including operation and maintenance of the air traffic control system, safety inspections, and other Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) activities. It does an adequate job ensuring that our airports and airways are safe and efficient.

Madam Chairman, I've had personal experience with the FAA and the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) as a community activist,

a state Senator, and now as a Member of Congress. In fact, I grew up about a mile from the Seattle/Tacoma International Airport (SeaTac), so I know how people are affected by airports first hand.

The Port of Seattle has been attempting to expand SeaTac for more than nine years. Over those years, I've had several problems with the way the Port and the FAA have dealt with this proposed expansion project. I feel they have severely underestimated the environmental impacts the new runway would have on local communities, including the potential financial costs of implementation. They have also failed to adequately evaluate other potential problems, including increased traffic that would arise from construction and the increased noise expansion would have on local schools and neighborhoods. Overall, I strongly believe the FAA and the Port have shown a disregard for the concerns of the local citizens who will have to bear the brunt of the negative results of this proposed expansion.

Considering my experience with this program, I believe there are three things that could have been included in the legislation that would have made it better for those that live and work around our countries' airports. First, I have concerns over the current executive branch dealing with pollution from aircraft. The principle agency in the federal government that deals with environmental impact is the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); however, when it comes to pollution resulting from aircraft it is the FAA. This wasn't always the case. Previously, the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the EPA was responsible for coordinating federal noise abatement activities, updating and developing new noise standards, and promoting research and education on the impacts of noise pollution. This office was eliminated in 1982. I believed the FAA has a strong disincentive for effectively handling aircraft pollution because their main function is to expand and promote aviation. On the other hand, the EPA is in a much better position to fairly analyze pollution from aircraft and thus effectively implement policy to deal with these impacts, because its chief objective is to protect people against dangerous environmental problems. I feel the bill should have transferred these powers from the FAA to EPA in order to properly study and better protect citizens in my district and others from aviation pollution.

Second, I would like to have seen the bill set aside more funds to directly compensate the public for the damage that it will have on their lives. A study has determined that the impact that the proposed 3rd runway would have on my constituents is around \$4 billion, but the plan by the Port includes only \$50 million in mitigation costs. This is clearly unfair. The citizens of communities surrounding the airport would have to bear the brunt of mitigating the environmental problems surrounding the proposed project, despite having very little input and decision making authority. I feel that the bill could have authorized more money for the use of directly compensating individuals impacted by new construction for areas like my district.

Third, I'm very concerned about the lack of congressional and local input in the decision making authority for approving FAA discretionary grants for new airport construction. While I understand the meaning of a discretionary program is that the federal agency has

the discretion in determining whether to appropriate the funds, I believe the current system so substantially displaces legislative input that it trumps the spirit of the separation of powers of our three branches of government, which is a critical part of our representative democracy. The Port of Seattle and the FAA negotiated a Record of Decision in July of 1997, despite serious objections from myself and my constituents. Our system is designed to have Members of Congress represent the concerns and interests of their home districts and thus executive decisions that impact a certain group of people should only be done with the consideration of the opinions of the Member who represents those people. I do not feel that my concerns have adequately been taken into consideration during this process, and I feel this is wrong.

Overall, I feel that the concerns of local citizens and thus Members of Congress who represent them are not sufficiently taken into consideration under the AIP, and will continue to advocate for changes to this program in the future. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1 shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he or she has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Airport Improvement Program Short-Term Extension Act of 1999".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 101.

The text of section 101 is as follows:

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS **SEC. 101. AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$1,205,000,000" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "\$2,410,000,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1999".

(b) OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) is amended by striking "March 31, 1999" and inserting "September 30, 1999".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 101?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 102.

The text of section 102 is as follows:

SEC. 102. AIRWAY FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) \$2,131,000,000 for fiscal year 1999.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 102?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 103.

The text of section 103 is as follows:

SEC. 103. FAA OPERATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM GENERAL FUND.—Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$5,158,000,000” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “\$5,632,000,000 for fiscal year 1999.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM TRUST FUND.—Section 48104(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking “FISCAL YEARS 1994–1998” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 1994–2000”; and

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “through 1998” and inserting “through 2000”.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON OBLIGATING OR EXPENDING AMOUNTS.—Section 48108(c) of such title is amended by striking “1998” and inserting “2000”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 103?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 104.

The text of section 104 is as follows:

SEC. 104. AIP DISCRETIONARY FUND.

Section 47115 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 104?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 201.

The text of section 201 is as follows:

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from Airport and Airway Trust Fund) is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 1998” and inserting “October 1, 1999”, and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) the following: “or the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 or the Airport Improvement Program Short-Term Extension Act of 1999”.

(b) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.—Section 9502 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no amount may be appropriated or credited to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund on and after the date of any expenditure from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund which is not permitted by this section. The determination of whether an ex-

pense is so permitted shall be made without regard to—

“(A) any provision of law which is not contained or referenced in this title or in a revenue Act, and

“(B) whether such provision of law is a subsequently enacted provision or directly or indirectly seeks to waive the application of this subsection.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR PRIOR OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure to liquidate any contract entered into (or for any amount otherwise obligated) before October 1, 1999, in accordance with the provisions of this section.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 201?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 99) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend Federal Aviation Administration programs through September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 31, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This vote will be followed by two 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus

Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)

Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter

Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Billakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes

Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren

Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markley
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo

Salmon	Spratt	Udall (CO)
Sanchez	Stabenow	Udall (NM)
Sanders	Stark	Upton
Sandlin	Stearns	Velazquez
Sanford	Stenholm	Vento
Sawyer	Strickland	Visclosky
Saxton	Stump	Walden
Scarborough	Stupak	Walsh
Schaffer	Sununu	Wamp
Schakowsky	Sweeney	Waters
Scott	Talent	Watkins
Sensenbrenner	Tancred	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tanner	Watts (OK)
Sessions	Tauscher	Waxman
Shadegg	Tauzin	Weiner
Shaw	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shays	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Sherman	Terry	Weller
Sherwood	Thomas	Wexler
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)	Weygand
Shows	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Shuster	Thornberry	Wicker
Simpson	Thune	Wise
Sisisky	Thurman	Wolf
Skelton	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Slaughter	Tierney	Wu
Smith (MI)	Toomey	Wynn
Smith (TX)	Towns	Young (AK)
Snyder	Trafficant	Young (FL)
Souder	Turner	

NAYS—3

Obey	Paul	Smith (WA)
------	------	------------

NOT VOTING—22

Cooksey	Granger	Rogan
Delahunt	Hall (OH)	Rush
DeLay	Kasich	Skeen
Deutsch	Lantos	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Largent	Spence
Dingell	Livingston	Wilson
Goodling	Maloney (NY)	
Graham	Martinez	

□ 1223

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 9. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 99, the Federal Aviation Administration Short-Term Extension, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 98 and H.R. 99.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 98, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 98, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Jenkins
Ackerman	DeGette	John
Aderholt	DeLauro	Johnson (CT)
Allen	DeMint	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dickey	Jones (NC)
Armey	Dixon	Kanjorski
Bachus	Doggett	Kaptur
Baird	Dooley	Kelly
Baker	Doolittle	Kennedy
Baldacci	Doyle	Kildee
Baldwin	Dreier	Kilpatrick
Ballenger	Duncan	Kind (WI)
Barcia	Dunn	King (NY)
Barr	Edwards	Kingston
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Klecza
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Klink
Bartlett	Emerson	Knollenberg
Barton	Engel	Kolbe
Bass	English	Kucinich
Bateman	Eshoo	Kuykendall
Becerra	Etheridge	LaFalce
Bentsen	Evans	LaHood
Bereuter	Everett	Lampson
Berkley	Ewing	Largent
Berman	Fattah	Larson
Berry	Filner	Latham
Biggert	Fletcher	LaTourette
Bilbray	Foley	Lazio
Bilirakis	Forbes	Leach
Bishop	Ford	Lee
Blagojevich	Fossella	Levin
Bliley	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Blunt	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Boehner	Frost	Lipinski
Bonilla	Gallegly	LoBiondo
Bonior	Ganske	Lofgren
Bono	Gejdenson	Lowey
Borski	Gekas	Lucas (KY)
Boswell	Gephardt	Lucas (OK)
Boucher	Gibbons	Luther
Boyd	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Brady (PA)	Gillmor	Maloney (NY)
Brady (TX)	Gilman	Manzullo
Brown (CA)	Gonzalez	Markey
Brown (FL)	Goode	Martinez
Brown (OH)	Goodlatte	Mascara
Burr	Goodling	Matsui
Burton	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Buyer	Goss	McCarthy (NY)
Callahan	Green (TX)	McCollum
Calvert	Green (WI)	McCrery
Camp	Greenwood	McDermott
Campbell	Gutierrez	McGovern
Canady	Gutknecht	McHugh
Cannon	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Capps	Hansen	McIntosh
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Cardin	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Carson	Hayes	McKinney
Castle	Hayworth	McNulty
Chabot	Hefley	Meehan
Chambliss	Herger	Meek (FL)
Chenoweth	Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)
Clay	Hill (MT)	Menendez
Clayton	Hilleary	Metcalf
Clement	Hilliard	Mica
Clyburn	Hinche	Millender-
Coble	Hinojosa	McDonald
Coburn	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Collins	Hoeffel	Miller, Gary
Combest	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Condit	Holden	Minge
Conyers	Holt	Mink
Cook	Hooley	Moakley
Costello	Horn	Mollohan
Cox	Hostettler	Moore
Coyne	Houghton	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Crane	Hulshof	Morella
Crowley	Hunter	Murtha
Cubin	Hutchinson	Nadler
Cummings	Hyde	Napolitano
Cunningham	Inslee	Neal
Danner	Istook	Nethercutt
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Ney
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Northup
Davis (VA)	(TX)	Nussle
Deal	Jefferson	Oberstar

Obey	Salmon	Taylor (NC)
Oliver	Sanchez	Terry
Ortiz	Sanders	Thomas
Ose	Sandlin	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Sanford	Thompson (MS)
Oxley	Sawyer	Thornberry
Packard	Saxton	Thune
Pallone	Scarborough	Thurman
Pascarella	Schaffer	Tiahrt
Pastor	Schakowsky	Tierney
Payne	Scott	Toomey
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Trafficant
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Turner
Petri	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Phelps	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Shays	Upton
Pickett	Sherman	Velazquez
Pombo	Sherwood	Vento
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Visclosky
Porter	Shows	Walden
Portman	Shuster	Walsh
Price (NC)	Simpson	Wamp
Pryce (OH)	Sisisky	Waters
Quinn	Skelton	Watkins
Radanovich	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Regula	Snyder	Weldon (FL)
Reyes	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Reynolds	Spratt	Weller
Riley	Stabenow	Wexler
Rivers	Stark	Weygand
Rodriguez	Stearns	Whitfield
Roemer	Stenholm	Wicker
Rogers	Strickland	Wilson
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wise
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wolf
Rothman	Sununu	Woolsey
Roukema	Talent	Wu
Roybal-Allard	Tancred	Wynn
Royce	Tanner	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Tauscher	Young (FL)
Ryun (KS)	Tauzin	
Sabo	Taylor (MS)	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—25

Bryant	Granger	Pitts
Cooksey	Hall (OH)	Rogan
Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Rush
DeLay	Kasich	Skeen
Deutsch	Lantos	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Livingston	Spence
Dingell	Myrick	Sweeney
Farr	Norwood	
Graham	Pease	

□ 1233

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program and to amend the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act to make technical and other corrections."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOURNAL

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 18, answered “present” 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—383

Abercrombie	DeGette	Jones (OH)
Aderholt	DeLauro	Kanjorski
Allen	DeMint	Kaptur
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Kelly
Archer	Dickey	Kennedy
Army	Dixon	Kildee
Bachus	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Baird	Dooley	Kind (WI)
Baker	Doolittle	King (NY)
Baldacci	Doyle	Kingston
Baldwin	Dreier	Kleczka
Ballenger	Duncan	Klink
Barcia	Dunn	Knollenberg
Barr	Edwards	Kolbe
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Kuykendall
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	LaFalce
Bartlett	Emerson	LaHood
Barton	Engel	Lampson
Bass	English	Lantos
Bateman	Eshoo	Largent
Becerra	Etheridge	Larson
Bentsen	Evans	Latham
Bereuter	Everett	LaTourette
Berkley	Fattah	Lazio
Berman	Fletcher	Leach
Berry	Foley	Lee
Biggart	Forbes	Levin
Bilbray	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Bilirakis	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Bishop	Fowler	Linder
Blagojevich	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Loftgren
Blumenauer	Frost	Lowe
Boehlert	Gallegly	Lucas (KY)
Boehner	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Bonilla	Gekas	Luther
Bonior	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Bono	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Borski	Gillmor	Manzullo
Boswell	Gilman	Markey
Boucher	Goode	Martinez
Boyd	Goodlatte	Mascara
Brady (PA)	Goodling	Matsui
Brady (TX)	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (CA)	Goss	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	McCollum
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McCrery
Bryant	Greenwood	McGovern
Burr	Gutknecht	McHugh
Buyer	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Callahan	Hansen	McIntosh
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Camp	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Campbell	Hayes	McKinney
Canady	Hayworth	McNulty
Cannon	Herger	Meehan
Capps	Hill (IN)	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hill (MT)	Meeks (NY)
Cardin	Hilleary	Menendez
Castle	Hinches	Metcalfe
Chabot	Hinojosa	Mica
Chambliss	Hobson	Millender-
Chenoweth	Hoeffel	McDonald
Clay	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Clayton	Holden	Miller, Gary
Clement	Holt	Miller, George
Clyburn	Hooley	Minge
Coble	Horn	Mink
Coburn	Hostettler	Moakley
Collins	Houghton	Mollohan
Combest	Hoyer	Moore
Condit	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Cook	Hunter	Morella
Costello	Hutchinson	Murtha
Cox	Hyde	Myrick
Coyne	Inslee	Nadler
Cramer	Istook	Napolitano
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Nethercutt
Cummings	(TX)	Ney
Cunningham	Jefferson	Northup
Danner	Jenkins	Norwood
Davis (FL)	John	Nussle
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Obey
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Ose
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Oxley

Packard	Sawyer	Thomas
Pallone	Saxton	Thompson (CA)
Pascarella	Scarborough	Thompson (MS)
Pastor	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Paul	Scott	Thune
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Thurman
Pease	Serrano	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Sessions	Tierney
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Toomey
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Towns
Petri	Shays	Trafficant
Phelps	Sherman	Turner
Pombo	Sherwood	Udall (CO)
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Udall (NM)
Porter	Shows	Upton
Portman	Shuster	Velazquez
Price (NC)	Simpson	Vento
Price (OH)	Sisisky	Visclosky
Quinn	Skelton	Walden
Rahall	Slaughter	Walsh
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Regula	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Watt (NC)
Reynolds	Snyder	Watts (OK)
Riley	Souder	Waxman
Rivers	Spratt	Weiner
Rodriguez	Stabenow	Weldon (FL)
Roemer	Stark	Weldon (PA)
Rogers	Stearns	Wexler
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Weygand
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Whitfield
Rothman	Stump	Wicker
Roukema	Stupak	Wilson
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Wise
Royce	Sweeney	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Talent	Woolsey
Ryun (KS)	Tancredo	Wu
Salmon	Tanner	Wynn
Sanchez	Tauscher	Young (AK)
Sanders	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Sandlin	Taylor (NC)	
Sanford	Terry	

NOES—18

Crane	LoBiondo	Ramstad
Filner	McDermott	Sabo
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Schaffer
Hefley	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hilliard	Olver	Waters
Kucinich	Pickett	Weller

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Carson

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman	Farr	Owens
Blunt	Frank (MA)	Pickering
Burton	Gejdenson	Pitts
Conyers	Gonzalez	Radanovich
Cooksey	Graham	Rogan
Delahunt	Granger	Rush
DeLay	Gutierrez	Skeen
Deutscher	Hall (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Kasich	Spence
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	
Ewing	Livingston	

□ 1241

Mr. LOBIONDO changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker. I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on February 3, 1999, during rollcall vote Nos. 9, 10, and 11. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 9, “yea” on rollcall vote No. 10, and “aye” on rollcall vote No. 11.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 393

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any reference to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) as a co-sponsor of H.R. 393, a bill to amend the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Con-

trol Act of 1978, to provide for the remediation of the Atlas uranium milling site near Moab, Utah, be deleted from the RECORD. His name was inadvertently included, and he has requested it be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was detained the last 2 days by a violent abdominal illness and was not able to attend the session yesterday.

Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on H.R. 68 and H.R. 432, rollcalls 7 and 8.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 1999.
Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that due to my recent appointment to the House International Relations Committee, I regretfully relinquish my membership on the House Science Committee.

Please take appropriate action to effect this change.

Sincerely,

BARBARA LEE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1245

INTRODUCTION OF GIVE FANS A CHANCE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, during the 25 years that I have been

privileged to work with communities across the country to help make them more livable, nothing has captured the imagination of the ordinary citizen more strongly than suggesting that our communities no longer be held hostage to the whims of billionaire sports team owners. The fact today is that a few dozen of America's richest people can decide for any reason at all that they are not making enough money, or they think they could make more money, or that they do not like the color of the stadium, or that perhaps they could squeeze more from the fans where they are by offering up the possibility that their team will be relocated somewhere else, perhaps to a town that some other owner has abandoned.

The bidding war with threats, implied or explicit, for taxpayers and fans to cough up millions more in subsidies to a franchise is a fact of life for fans in more than half of America's metropolitan areas. It has been a sad spectacle that started in the 1950s when the profitable Brooklyn Dodgers and their compatriots, the New York Giants, both baseball teams, left for greener pastures in California. This has triggered a parade of franchise relocation, many times not because of a lack of fan support or financial support but simply because the owners felt they could get a better deal elsewhere. Witness the recent sad situation of the long-suffering fans in Cleveland, Ohio, who have been in that icebox of a stadium year in and year out to capacity and now the Browns are gone.

The sad fact is that the Federal Government aids and abets this relocation process. It grants an antitrust broadcast exemption that makes franchises worth hundreds of millions of dollars and makes the leagues possible and extraordinarily profitable. The NFL alone in the most recent round of contract negotiations netted \$17.5 billion.

Still there is no stability for the American fan, and they continue to pay more for tickets, more for parking, more for taxes, more for seat licenses, more for concessions that make it less affordable, less comfortable for the community and ever more lucrative for the few who profit.

It does not have to be this way. I have introduced the Give Fans a Chance Act which would require that leagues follow their stated rules on relocation and consider the community impact, actually involve the community in the decisionmaking process.

My legislation would give local communities the opportunity, after this analysis takes place, to actually match a bid for a franchise that might otherwise be relocated. And, most important, it would not allow these professional sports leagues to have artificial restraints on who can own a team.

The NFL, for example, has decreed there will be no more Green Bay Packers style community ownership. One has got to be a billionaire. Green Bay, Wisconsin, one thirty-fourth the size of Los Angeles, has one of the most suc-

cessful franchises in professional sports, and it is owned by 1,950 shareholders. Little Green Bay, Wisconsin, does not have to worry that when they invest millions of dollars in their facilities, that somehow an owner is going to decide to relocate elsewhere, and it has made a profound difference in that community.

The NFL and others argue that Green Bay is an aberration, a special case, that it cannot be replicated anywhere else, that people in other communities are not smart enough to figure this out. I disagree. I do not think Green Bay, as unique as that community is, is an aberration and a special case, and I think we ought to at least give other fans the same chance.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Give Fans a Chance legislation. I strongly urge long-suffering sports fans to lend their voice. If the American people are heard, truly we will give the sports fans a chance.

DECENNIAL CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of the upcoming decennial census which is just 13 months away. A year from next month, the forms will be going into the mail, tens of millions of them, all across America to count everyone. We need to do the best job we can, without politics, to get everyone counted.

Sadly, this administration has proposed a historic change. Because for every census since Thomas Jefferson in 1790, we have attempted to count everyone, but this administration has wanted to use polling techniques in order to say, "We don't need to count everyone. Let me just guesstimate at the numbers."

Fortunately last week the Supreme Court finally said, "No, you've got to count." The actual enumeration as stated in the Constitution is the law of the land. We need to count everyone for purposes of apportionment.

Sadly, this administration does not want to listen to the courts. They have got this idea now that they want to have a two-number census. What they are proposing is, we will have a set of numbers provided that the Supreme Court says are the legal numbers, and then the Clinton Administration wants to adjust these numbers and have a Clinton set of numbers. And so for every city and county in this great country we are going to have two sets of numbers, a Supreme Court set of numbers and the Clinton numbers.

We have enough cynicism and doubts in this country, and we need to have trust in our government. We do not need to create the confusion of two sets of numbers. The Census Bureau and the professionals at least in the past have argued against two sets of numbers. Hopefully they will stand by their prin-

ciples and say two sets of numbers are wrong, because we can only have one set of numbers. It is what is required by law and that is what the Supreme Court has ruled.

To do the census is difficult work. It is hard work. It costs a lot of money. Because we only do it once every 10 years, we need to concentrate all of our efforts into doing the best census possible. Because if we try to do two censuses, we are going to have two failed censuses, and that is wrong for America.

Can my colleagues just imagine every community having the choice of two numbers? This is a lawyer's dream. In fact, Justice Scalia at the oral arguments of the Supreme Court last November said, "Are we going to be creating a whole new area of census law?" That is exactly what could happen with a two-number census.

What we need to do, as I proposed last week to the Conference of Mayors, is a proposal to put all the resources we can and all the actions that this Congress can provide to get the best census possible. Everybody should be counted. I have proposed a series of provisions, from increasing the amount of paid advertising from \$100 million to \$400 million, from the idea that we will need another 100,000 more enumerators to get the job done right.

Yes, we are proposing to increase the spending on the census in order to get the best census possible that is trusted by the American people. Why not use AmeriCorps? I have doubts that we need AmeriCorps, but a Republican advocating using AmeriCorps for the census I think is rather significant.

Something else that we are proposing is something called the post-census local review. I think almost every mayor and county commissioner in this country will support this. It was used in the 1990 census. What it is is that after the Census Bureau gets their numbers, they are sent back to the local communities to evaluate, to in effect conduct an audit and to see if there is something missing. If there is, they can raise the issue with the Census Bureau and then the Census Bureau will adjust the numbers if those challenges and questions are correctly adjusted.

Why not, to build trust in our census, allow communities a chance to review the numbers before they become official? What are the Census Bureau and the administration afraid of, trusting our local officials like we did in 1990 to have a chance to review it before it becomes official?

I also propose that we work together with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) on legislation to make it available, for example, that welfare workers or retired officers have the right without losing their benefits to work temporarily for the Census Bureau. We want to get local people involved in the Census.

I have held hearings of the Subcommittee on Census in Miami, and

most recently in Phoenix where we met with American Indians, getting the input and ideas of how do we address the issue. What we have found out over and over is we need local people involved in the process. We need local advertising that targets the local community as best we can.

We can conduct a good census and get the best census ever. But if we are going to play games with this administration and say we are going to have two censuses, which is illegal, we are going to waste our efforts and have two failed censuses. Let us work together and get the best census possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHITHER THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I spoke on this floor in reference to the many, many promises the President made in his State of the Union speech and in the days just before and just after that speech. As Senator Everett Dirksen said many years ago, "A billion here and a billion there and pretty soon it adds up to some real money." It is probably the easiest thing in the world to spend other people's money.

It is also one of the easiest things in the world to promise government money for everything to everybody. Yet as the National Taxpayers Union pointed out after the State of the Union speech, the promises contained therein would require \$288.4 billion in

increased spending in the first year alone. The next week, last week, Newsweek magazine published a chart showing that all these new promises would, if enacted, cause a \$2.3 trillion shortfall over the next 15 years.

On election day of 1994 when control of the Congress changed parties, the stock market, the Dow Jones average, was at 3800. It has now reached as high as 9600. One of the main reasons our economy has been so strong over these last 4 or 4½ years has been that we finally started bringing Federal spending under control. We are even, temporarily at least, having some surpluses.

But let me point out how big a change this is. A few months after President Clinton took office, Alice Rivlin, his Director of the Office of Management and Budget, put out a shocking memo. She said that if we did not make major changes in spending, we would have yearly deficits of over \$1 trillion a year by the year 2010 and between \$4 and \$5 trillion a year by the year 2030.

If we had allowed that to happen, our entire economy would have crashed. No one would have been able to buy a car or a home. Our children of today would have seen their standard of living not even probably 5 or 10 percent of what it is when they are in the prime of their lives, if we had sat around and let the ridiculous and wasteful Federal spending that was going on continue.

□ 1300

Sometimes it is far more compassionate to not spend money and instead leave more money with the families of America to spend on their children as they see fit. Today taxes and government spending are at all-time highs. There is a misimpression by some that government spending has been cut in recent years. Really all we have done is slow down the great increases that were going on.

When I first came to the Congress, every department or agency was routinely receiving 12 and 15 and 18, even 20 percent increases in spending each year. Everyone knew that we could not continue spending at that rate, everyone knew that that would lead very soon to a major crash of our economy, and so we were able to get things under a little better control and decrease or cut these increases in spending down to about 3 percent a year, something that we have been able to live with.

But today the average person, the average family, spends about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes and at least another 10 percent in government regulatory costs. A Member of the other body, Senator FRED THOMPSON from my State of Tennessee, ran some ads a couple of years ago which were so true. He said today one spouse works to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family. This is why we are talking about tax cuts.

But if we allow all these promises and programs that have been made in

recent weeks to be enacted, we will get back into trouble so quick it will make your head swim. We will get back just where we were a few years ago. We will not see these surpluses that are predicted for the years ahead. To enact bills that allow, as Newsweek said, a shortfall of \$2.3 trillion over the next 15 years would just be unconscionable.

And I want to place in the RECORD at this point a column on the State of the Union speech written by nationally syndicated columnist Charley Reese, which I think sums up far better than I have the situation that we will get back into if we are not careful:

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Jan. 28, 1999]

DON'T BUY INTO LIES ON TOP OF LIES ABOUT A NONEXISTENT SURPLUS

(By Charley Reese)

The first thing to keep in mind when evaluating Bill Clinton's laundry list of promises, made in his state of the Union speech, is that Mr. Clinton is a proven liar.

As any misled wife can tell you, the practical problem in dealing with a liar is deciding when, if ever, he is telling the truth and when he is lying. Lying is far more serious than liars would have you believe.

Two main lies underlie his speech.

One is the lie that Social Security needs saving. Well, only from politicians. The current tax brings in more than enough money to keep the Social Security Trust Fund solvent, but Congress and presidents use the surplus to offset deficits in other places in order to promulgate the second lie—that the budget has a surplus.

Both Republicans and Democrats are co-conspirators in this con job.

So, starting with two lies, Clinton then proceeds to spend a nonexistent surplus stretching 15 years into the future. Even if this year's surplus were real, there is no way to predict that the surpluses will continue for 15 years into the future. That is pure fantasy.

Clinton's promising this and promising that, all financed by a nonexistent future surplus, is a perfect example of demagoguery. Furthermore, everything Clinton proposed, except spending more on defense (again with the mythical surplus money), is unconstitutional.

Yes, I know that nobody pays any attention to the Constitution except lawyers trying to get around the democratic process. But, nevertheless, if you will just read the document, you will notice that nowhere is the federal government authorized to get involved in local land planning, health care (long- or short-term), child care, urban sprawl, education or discouraging kids from smoking tobacco. (God knows they've done a poor job of discouraging them from smoking dope).

It's dismaying that more people can't see through this thinly disguised con game Washington politicians are playing. They do polls. They find out what folks are worrying about. They promise to fix it. They pretend they can fix it, despite a deplorable record of failure (\$5 trillion and the feds lost the War on Poverty; \$40 billion and they lost the war on drugs). They pretend they can do it at no cost. This year, they will all be spending the mythical surpluses, which, like psychics, they know will come in the future.

All this amounts to is blatant vote-buying, as corrupt as if they were standing outside the voting booths, stuffing \$20 bills into people's pockets. It amounts to robbing Jane to buy the vote of Betsy.

Why should one working mother, who pays for her own child care, be taxed to provide free child care to someone else?

The low-life, unprincipled politicians have turned government in America largely into a racket, and it appears that many Americans have become so corrupt themselves that they don't care as long as they get a piece of the booty.

Well, from the point of view of a paid observer, watching a society collapse is probably more interesting than watching one that is running smoothly, but nevertheless I don't recommend it.

I don't know of any greater civic sin a people can commit than taking this great country, created and preserved at such a great price in blood, sweat and tears, and tossing it away just because Americans have become too damned lazy, timid, greedy and irresponsible to preserve it for posterity.

Despite what you hear, the state of this union isn't very good.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN HELPING STUDENTS MEET HIGH ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard from all of our colleagues, from the President of the United States and from governors across this land, education is the top issue on the public agenda and accountability is the order of the day. Parents and taxpayers want quality schools that show results in helping students meet high academic standards. The President says that he wants us to have world class standards so that students in the United States can compete in a world economy with the students and citizens of any Nation in the world, and I think that that is important.

The Federal Government over the past three decades has spent some \$118 billion in funding the Title I education programs, with rather mixed and variable results, and now we are looking to invest many billions more over the next five years. In fact, we will invest something in the neighborhood of \$40 billion over the next five years in Title I, a program that is designed to help in the main educationally and economically disadvantaged children. But what is it we are getting for that investment, and how can we ensure that we will in fact get a better return on that investment of \$40 billion than we received on the first \$118 billion that we invested?

We have been told by the Republican leadership of the House and, I believe, also in the Senate that the expansion of the so-called Ed-Flex bill will be one of the first items of their agenda in meeting some of the educational needs of this country. Currently there are 12 States that receive broad authority to waive many of the Federal laws and regulations with respect to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

My question is, I want to know, for the granting of that waiver for the additional flexibility to let school districts use this money in their best judgment for their best purposes, what

is it they are telling us they are prepared to do on behalf of America's students and on behalf of the families that are so terribly concerned about the education of their children?

They tell us that States are being held accountable under Ed-Flex for their actions and that they have put in place a procedure of accountability, and yet when we look at the GAO report that has recently been issued on Ed-Flex, we find out that that is not necessarily the case. We find out, according to GAO, that many Ed-Flex States, these 12 States that have been granted this authority, have not established any goals or defined only vague objectives.

One State's plan, in exchange for flexibility in Federal dollars, says that they have a commitment to the identification and implementation of programs that will create an environment in which students actualize their academic potential. For that we are handing them millions of dollars, so that they can create an environment and the implementation of programs so that students will actualize their academic potential. No suggestion of how we would measure that or whether we know that is true.

Yet we find a State like Texas which has said not only will they set out specific numerical criteria that are closely tied to both schools and districts and the specific students affected by the waiver; the Governor of Texas has said what he will do and what the State legislature of Texas has agreed to do and the Department of Education, in exchange for the flexibility under Ed-Flex from rules and regulations of the Federal Government, that he expects that the districts that receive the waivers under this act, that they will make annual gains on the State tests so that 90 percent, 90 percent of his students will pass the State assessment in reading and math.

In addition, the Governor of Texas goes even further than that. He says that the districts must make gains so that at the end of that same five-year period 90 percent of the African American students will pass the State exam, 90 percent of the Hispanic students, 90 percent of the white students and 90 percent of the economically disadvantaged students. For that we have granted them a waiver and access to millions of dollars of Federal moneys for education.

I am asking Members of Congress and the administration, which plan would you rather invest in? Would you rather invest in a plan that gives you numerical goals and standards and achievement for our students in this country, or would you rather invest in a plan that gives you rhetoric about some ephemeral goal that may or may not be achieved and no timetables and no standards as to how they will achieve that?

If we are going to be the venture capitalists in improving education in this country with the limited Federal dol-

lars that we have, that in this one program will provide over \$40 billion, I think like any venture capitalist we ought to ask what is the return we are getting on that money, because there are a lot of uses for that \$40 billion and every Member of Congress has a different priority.

But we ought to be asking, what are we going to get back? The Governor of Texas has told us what we will get back is a 90 percent passage rate at the end of five years on a high-quality State test that will test their ability to perform in both reading and mathematics. In the other 12 States it is something in between. A lot of it is rhetoric, a lot of it is no goals and no accountability.

The President stood here in the State of the Union and said that he wanted accountability, the parents wanted accountability, and clearly Members of Congress do. When the Ed-Flex bill comes to the floor, we should demand that it have provisions for accountability. We ought to at least demand something as rigorous as the Governor of Texas and the State legislature were prepared to put on the line in the name of education reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHAFFER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPUBLICAN AGENDA FOR THIS YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit about the Republican agenda for this year, and that agenda is called Best Schools and Military and Agriculture, and "BEST" in this case stands for balancing the budget, "E" is for education, "S" is for saving Social Security, "T" is for lowering taxes and, of course, having the best military and agriculture.

We want to balance the budget, but first we believe that Social Security,

that part of the surplus needs to be firewalled and protected, not masked in with the rest of the general operating expenses. We believe Social Security should be a freestanding account. That lowers the amount of the surplus, and then that amount of the surplus should be divided out between lowering down the debt and tax reductions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, think about this: If you have a credit card and each month you run up a big deficit, and one month you do not, does that mean you are excused from all the months of debt that you accumulated? Of course not. You have got to go back and pay the debt. And I do not believe the President is being responsible when he does not mention paying down the debt as part of his agenda. We have got to pay down the \$5.4 trillion debt.

In education we believe in local control, we believe in sending the dollars back to the teacher in the classroom, not sending more dollars to the Washington bureaucracy so you can have more Washington bureaucrats telling local school boards how to teach Johnny how to read.

On saving the Social Security: Number 1, firewall it. Make sure that that Social Security surplus is designated for its intended purposes and not used for roads and bridges.

And on tax reductions we believe that the middle class is working too hard to earn their money and that we are wasting too much of it. I believe that it is important for us to have a good government present, I believe we have to fund a lot of essential programs, but what the taxpayers who are working 50 and 60 hours a week resent, and rightfully so, is the duplication and waste in government, and we have got to cut down some of the absurdities in our government.

And on the military, we have to have the strongest Army in the world. America has to be the defender of freedom and democracy around the globe. Unfortunately we did say, okay, let us be the policemen of the world; it is just the way it is.

We need to have a military that has modern equipment, we need to have a military that is ready, and we need to have quality of life for our soldiers. We lose lots and lots of soldiers every year because they can get better jobs at higher pay and they do not have to worry about being deployed all over the globe the way this administration seems to deploy people.

This administration's approach to foreign policy is let us deploy American troops and leave them there permanently. If we are going to commit American troops to an area, let us go for an objective, let us have a time frame, let us have a plan for lasting peace and stability once we leave, but let us leave.

And then finally on agriculture, America needs to have support of an abundant and lasting food supply. We have one of the greatest agricultural economies in the world. America has

only spent 11 cents of the dollar that they earn on food and on groceries, and yet we forget the American farmer. We need to have crop insurance reform, we need to look at some of the unfair trade practices of our foreign importers, and we need to do everything we can to unshackle the farmer from some of the unnecessary regulations that they are operating under.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield the floor to my friend and colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) who wants to talk about the surplus.

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that Newsweek magazine said a little over a week ago that if we enacted everything that the President has promised in the last few days, we would have a \$2.3 trillion shortfall in the next 15 years and totally really wreck our good economy. But I mentioned a column that I want to include in the RECORD by nationally syndicated columnist Charley Reese, and I want to read a portion of that column at this time.

He said after the State of the Union in his column:

So, starting with two lies, the President then proceeds to spend a nonexistent surplus stretching 15 years into the future. Even if this year's surplus were real, there is no way to predict that the surpluses will continue for 15 years into the future. That is pure fantasy.

The President's promising this and promising that, all financed by a nonexistent future surplus, is a perfect example of demagoguery. Furthermore, everything he proposed, except spending more on defense, is unconstitutional.

Yes, I know that nobody pays any attention to the Constitution except lawyers trying to get around it, and so forth.

But he continues in this column, Mr. Reese does. He says:

It's dismaying that more people can't see through this thinly disguised con game Washington politicians are playing. All this amounts to is blatant vote-buying, as corrupt as if they were standing outside the voting booths, stuffing \$20 bills into people's pockets. It amounts to robbing Jane to buy the vote of Betsy.

□ 1315

I tell you, as I said a minute ago, if we do what the children and what the families of this country need, we will hold back on this and not go into all of this ridiculous and wasteful spending, so that our good economic times can continue. But it will be so easy to end these good times if we fall off and go along with all of these high sounding and wonderful promises that have been made over the last few days.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think it is very important for us to remember, Mr. Speaker, that that surplus largely comes from Social Security, and what we want to do is protect Social Security, pay down the debt and then look at tax reduction for the middle class, because there is so much waste and duplication of government.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule XI clause 2(a)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the 106th Congress, I am requesting that the new Rules of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, which were adopted on January 20, 1999, be printed in their entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS, AS ADOPTED ON JANUARY 20, 1999

RULE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. (a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, each shall be privileged in the Committee and subcommittees and shall be decided without debate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

2. The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the Committee under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

3. The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE II—POWERS AND DUTIES

1. The powers and duties of the Committee are all those such as are enumerated or contained in the Rules of the House and the rulings and precedents of the House or the Committee.

2. For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized—

(a) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings; except as provided in Rule XI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House;

(b) To conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate, and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X of the Rules of the House) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith. The ranking minority Member of the full Committee or the relevant subcommittee shall be notified in advance at such times as any Committee funds are expended for investigations and studies involving international travel; and

(c) To require, by subpoena or otherwise (subject to clause 3(a)), the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, in whatever form, as it deems necessary. The Chairperson of the Committee, or any Member designated by the Chairperson, may administer oaths to any witness.

Subpoenas

3. (a) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee

under clause 2(c) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under clause 2(c) may be delegated to the Chairperson of the Committee pursuant to such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairperson of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(b) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee under clause 2(c) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

Review of continuing programs

4. The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph, a government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 3(d)(3)(A) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

5. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

Budget Act reports

6. The Committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget—

(a) the Committee's views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(b) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within the Committee's jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

7. As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate Committee or Committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 or section 602 (in the case of fiscal years 1991 through 1995) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

8. Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Oversight report

9. Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House. The Chairperson shall

consult with the ranking minority Member on the formulation of the oversight plan, and the Committee may not meet to adopt the plan unless a copy of the plan has been provided to all Members not less than two days in advance of the Committee meeting.

RULE III—MEETINGS

Regular meetings

1. Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the first Tuesday of each month while the Congress is in session, and the Chairperson shall provide to each Member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, when the Chairperson believes that the Committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full Committee and that there is no other timely business to be transacted at a regular meeting, then no Committee meeting shall be held on that day. In such instances, the Chairperson shall not issue the notice of the regular meeting to the Members and the failure to receive such notice shall be treated by the Members as a cancellation of the regular meeting.

Additional and special meetings

2. (a) The Chairperson may call and convene, as the Chairperson considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the chair.

(b) No bill or joint resolution shall be considered by the Committee unless (i) such measure has been made available to all Members at least two calendar days (three calendar days when the bill or joint resolution has not been ordered reported by the subcommittee of jurisdiction) prior to the meeting, accompanied by a section-by-section analysis of such measure; and (ii) the Chairperson has notified Members of the time and place of the meeting at least two calendar days (three calendar days when the bill or joint resolution has not been ordered reported by the subcommittee of jurisdiction) before the commencement of the meeting. The provisions of this paragraph may be suspended by the Committee by a two-thirds vote or by the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the ranking minority Member of the full Committee.

3. If at least three Members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairperson, those Members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairperson for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairperson of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairperson does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the Committee shall notify all Members of the Committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

Open meetings

4. (a) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or each subcommittee thereof, shall be open to the public including to radio, television and still photography coverage, except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House; provided, however, that no person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(b) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public including to radio, television and still photography coverage except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information or would violate any law or rule of the House. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present (there being in attendance the requisite number required under the Rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information or violate clause 6(e) of Rule IV; or

(2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause 6 of Rule IV.

No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by a majority vote authorize the Committee or a particular subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this paragraph for closing hearings to the public; provided, however, that the Committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close on subsequent day of hearings.

Broadcasting of committee meetings

5. Any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, subject to the requirements and limitations of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any meeting or hearing of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the Chairperson of the Committee, the subcommittee Chairperson, or other Member of the Committee presiding at such meeting. The number of television or still cameras shall not be limited to fewer than two representatives from each medium except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized.

Additional provisions

6. Meetings and hearings of the Committee or subcommittee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairperson or, in the Chairperson's absence, by the Member designated by the Chairperson as the Vice Chairperson of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the ranking majority Member of the Committee or subcommittee present.

7. No person other than a Member of Congress, Committee staff, or a person from a Member's staff when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may stand in or be seated at the rostrum area of the Committee unless the Chairperson determines otherwise.

RULE IV—HEARING PROCEDURES

1. The Chairperson, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee Chairperson, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the ranking minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairperson shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify all Members of the Committee; the Daily Digest; Chief Clerk; Official Reporters; and the Committee scheduling service of House Information Systems as soon as possible after such announcement is made.

2. (a) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his or her appearance, 200 copies of the proposed testimony if the appearance is before the Committee, or 100 copies of the proposed testimony if the appearance is before a subcommittee; provided, however, that this requirement may be modified or waived by the Chairperson of the Committee or appropriate subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority Member, when the Chairperson determines it to be in the best interest of the Committee or subcommittee, and furthermore, that this requirement shall not be mandatory if a witness is given less than seven days notice of appearance prior to a hearing.

(b) The Chairperson may require a witness to limit the oral presentation to a summary of the statement.

(c) Each witness in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

3. Upon announcement of a hearing, the clerk and staff director shall cause to be prepared a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other materials) under consideration which shall be made available immediately to all Members of the Committee.

Calling and interrogation of witnesses

4. Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party Members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairperson by a majority of those minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses

selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

5. Except when the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to subdivisions (B) and (C) of clause 2(j)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, Committee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairperson for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all Members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one Member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all Members present. The questioning of witnesses in both the full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairperson, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other Members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing Members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairperson shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority Members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the Members of the majority.

Investigative hearing procedures

6. The following additional rules shall apply to investigative hearings:

(a) The Chairperson, at any investigative hearing, shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(b) A copy of the Committee rules and Rule XI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House shall be made available to each witness.

(c) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(d) The Chairperson may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(e) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person,

(i) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4(b) of Rule III, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the Rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(ii) the Committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the Members of the Committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. In either case the Committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(f) Except as provided in paragraph (e), the Chairperson shall receive and the Committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(g) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public session without the consent of the Committee.

(h) In the discretion of the Committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(i) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public ses-

sion, or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee.

RULE V—REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

1. (a) It shall be the duty of the Chairperson of the Committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(b) In any event, the report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairperson of the Committee notice of the filing of that request.

2. No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless the quorum requirement of clause 1(a) of Rule VI is satisfied.

Committee reports

3. The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall include—

(a) a cover page, which must show that supplemental, minority and additional views (if any), the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the recommendations of the Committee on Government Reform (whenever submitted), are included in the report;

(b) the amendments adopted by the Committee;

(c) a section-by-section analysis of the bill as reported, whenever possible;

(d) an explanation of the legislation; if the Chairperson decides one is necessary;

(e) with respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure, and on any amendment offered to the measure, the total number of votes cast for and against, or present not voting and the names of those Members voting for and against, or present not voting;

(f) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House separately set out and clearly identified;

(g) the statement required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority, new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law;

(h) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the Committee;

(i) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Reform under clause 4(c)(2) of Rule X of the Rules of the House separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the Committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the Committee's deliberations of the measure;

(j) for a bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the Committee, a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution;

(k) a statement in accordance with section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(l) any supplemental, minority, or additional views, if submitted in accordance with clause 5;

(m) the Ramseyer document required under clause 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House; and

(n) the estimate and comparison of costs incurred in carrying out the bill or resolution, as may be required by clauses 3(d)(2), 3(d)(3), 3(h)(2) and 3(h)(3) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

4. The report of the Committee, when filed with the House, shall be accompanied by three copies of the bill or resolution as introduced and one copy of the bill or resolution as amended.

5. If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member, with the clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more Members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. When time guaranteed by this subparagraph has expired (or if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the Committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk not later than one hour after the expiration of such time. No report shall be filed until the Chairperson has notified, with opportunity for discussion, the ranking minority Member of the Committee and the Chairperson of the subcommittee from which the legislation emanated or would have emanated. The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(i) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(ii) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views and any material submitted under paragraphs (h) and (i) of clause 3 are included as part of the report.

(b) This clause does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided in paragraph (a); or

(ii) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error or omission in a previous report made by the Committee upon that measure or matter.

(c) After an adjournment of the last regular session of Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a Member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(d) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chair of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report

for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

Hearing prints

6. If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House except as otherwise provided in clause 4 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

RULE VI—QUORUMS

1. (a) A quorum, for the purpose of reporting any bill or resolution, of authorizing a subpoena, or of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)) shall consist of a majority of the Committee actually present.

(b) A quorum, for the purpose of taking any action other than those specified in clause 1(a) shall consist of one-third of the Members of the Committee.

(c) A quorum, for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, shall consist of any two Members of the Committee.

Proxies

2. No vote by any Member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure may be cast by proxy.

RULE VII—SUBCOMMITTEE—JURISDICTION

1. There shall be in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services the following standing subcommittees: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity; Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit; Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy; Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises; and Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations; each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned to it by this rule. Subcommittee jurisdictions are as follows:

Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity

(a) The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity extends to and includes:

(i) all matters relating to housing (except programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; rural housing; housing and homeless assistance programs; all activities of the Government National Mortgage Association; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design and safety standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; housing counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord/tenant relations); real estate lending including regulation of settlement procedures;

(ii) matters relating to community development and community and neighborhood planning, training and research; national urban growth policies; urban/rural research and technologies; and regulation of interstate land sales;

(iii) all matters relating to all government sponsored insurance programs, including those offering protection against crime, fire, flood (and related land use controls), earthquake and other natural hazards; and

(iv) the qualifications for and designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (other than matters relating to tax benefits).

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit

(b) The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit extends to and includes:

(i) all agencies which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit insurance for, financial institutions, and the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits;

(ii) all auxiliary matters affecting or arising in connection with the supervisory and regulatory activities of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve System, the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the National Credit Union Administration, together with those activities and operations of any other agency or department which relate to both domestic or foreign financial institutions;

(iii) with respect to financial institutions and the department and agencies which regulate or supervise them, all activities relating to and arising in connection with the matters of chartering, branching, mergers, acquisitions, consolidations, and conversions;

(iv) with respect to financial institutions and the agencies which regulate them, all activities relating to and arising in connection with the sale or underwriting of insurance and other noninsured instruments by financial institutions and their affiliates other than securities;

(v) all matters relating to consumer credit, including the provision of consumer credit by insurance companies, and further including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth in lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, fair credit reporting and the use of credit information by credit bureaus and credit providers, equal credit opportunity, debt collection practices, and electronic funds transfers;

(vi) creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, credit and debit cards and the preemption of State usury laws;

(vii) all matters relating to consumer access to financial services, including the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act;

(viii) the terms and rules of disclosure of financial services, including the advertisement, promotion and pricing of financial services, and availability of government check cashing services;

(ix) issues relating to consumer access to savings accounts and checking accounts in financial institutions, including lifeline banking and other consumer accounts; and

(x) all matters relating to the business of insurance, other than government sponsored insurance programs.

Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy

(c) The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy extends to and includes:

(i) all matters relating to all multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto, and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions;

(ii) all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee relating to international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank;

(iii) the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto;

(iv) international investment policies, both as they relate to United States investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States;

(v) all matters relating to financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy, all matters relating to economic growth and stabilization, and all defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and all related matters thereto;

(vi) all matters relating to domestic monetary policy and agencies which directly or indirectly affect domestic monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, the allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic and foreign financial institutions;

(vii) all matters relating to coins, coinage, currency and medals, including commemorative coins and medals, proof and mint sets and other special coins, the Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, currency denominations and design, the distribution of coins, and the operations and activities of the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; provided, however, that the Subcommittee shall not schedule a hearing on any commemorative medal or commemorative coin legislation unless the legislation is cosponsored by at least two-thirds of the Members of the House and has been recommended by the U.S. Mint's Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee in the case of a commemorative coin. The Subcommittee shall not report a bill or measure authorizing commemorative coins which does not conform with the mintage restrictions under 31 USC 5112. In considering legislation authorizing Congressional gold medals, the subcommittee shall apply the following standards:

(A) the recipient shall be a natural person;

(B) the recipient shall have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement;

(C) the recipient shall not have received a medal previously for the same or substantially the same achievement;

(D) the recipient shall be living or, if deceased, shall have been deceased for not less than five years and not more than 25 years; and

(E) the achievements were performed in the recipient's field of endeavor, and represent either a lifetime of continuous superior achievements or a single achievement so significant that the recipient is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises

(d) The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises extends to and includes:

(i) all matters relating to depository institution securities activities, including the activities of any affiliates, except for functional regulation under applicable securities laws not involving safety and soundness;

(ii) all matters related to bank capital markets activities;

(iii) all matters related to the activities of financial institutions in financial markets involving futures, forwards, options and other types of derivative instruments;

(iv) all matters relating to secondary market organizations for home mortgages including the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation;

(v) all matters related to the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight; and

(vi) all matters related to the Federal Housing Finance Board and the supervision and operation of the Federal Home Loan Banks.

Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations

(e) The Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations shall have the responsibility of reviewing and studying, on a continuing basis:

(i) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities which have responsibility for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated;

(ii) any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and present any such recommendations as deemed necessary to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the Committee;

(iii) forecasting and future oriented research on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and shall study all reports, documents and data pertinent to the jurisdiction of the Committee and make the necessary recommendations or reports thereon to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the Committee; and

(iv) the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee; provided, however, that the operations of the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations shall in no way limit the responsibility of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services from carrying out their oversight duties.

Subcommittees—Referral of legislation

2. Each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in this rule referred to or initiated by the full Committee shall on a bi-monthly basis be referred by the Chairperson to the subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction or retained at the full Committee for its consideration unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, the referral or consideration is to be otherwise. Referral under this clause shall not be effective until each subcommittee Chairperson is notified of the Chairperson's referral decision. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this clause may be recalled therefrom at any time for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee by a majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, or by the Chairperson (unless provided otherwise by a majority vote of the majority Members of the full Committee).

3. In carrying out this rule with respect to any matter, the Chairperson shall designate

a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction; but also may refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees, for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction; or may refer portions of the matter to one or more additional subcommittees (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) for the consideration only of designated portions; or may refer the matter to a special ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairperson with the approval of the Committee (with members from the subcommittees having jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the Committee thereon; or may make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

RULE VIII—SUBCOMMITTEES—POWERS AND DUTIES

1. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee Chairpersons shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairperson and other subcommittee Chairpersons and with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

2. Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chairperson of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any Member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the Committee. It shall be the duty of the Chairperson of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take steps or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

3. No bill or joint resolution approved by a subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee unless such measure, as approved, has been made available to all Members at least two calendar days prior to the meeting, accompanied by a section-by-section analysis of such measure.—The provisions of this paragraph may be suspended by the Committee by a two-thirds vote or by the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the ranking minority Member of the full Committee.

4. All Committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to a legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

5. Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the Committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full Committee in the order in which they were reported unless the Chairperson after consultation with the ranking minority Member and appropriate subcommittee Chairperson, otherwise directs; provided, however, that no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless each Member has been provided with reasonable time prior to the meeting to analyze such bill, together with a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change.

6. No bill or joint resolution may be considered by a subcommittee unless such measure has been made available to all Members at least two calendar days prior to the meeting, accompanied by a section-by-section analysis of such measure. The provisions of this paragraph may be waived following consultation with the appropriate ranking minority Member.

7. The Chairperson and ranking minority Member of the Committee shall be *ex officio*, non-voting members of each subcommittee of the Committee.

RULE IX—SUBCOMMITTEES—SIZE AND RATIOS

1. To the extent that the number of subcommittees and their party ratios permit, the size of all subcommittees shall be established so that the majority party Members of the Committee have an equal number of subcommittee assignments; provided, however, that a majority Member may waive his or her right to an equal number of subcommittee assignments on the Committee.

2. The following shall be the sizes and ratios for subcommittees:

(a) Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity: Total 26—Majority 14, Minority 12.

(b) Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit: Total 28—Majority 15, Minority 13.

(c) Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy: Total 26—Majority 14, Minority 12.

(d) Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises: Total 28—Majority 15, Minority 13.

(e) Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations: Total 10—Majority 6, Minority 4.

RULE X—BUDGET AND STAFF

1. The Chairperson, in consultation with other Members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigations and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees and shall present same to the Committee.

2. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), the professional and investigative staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairperson and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairperson.

(b) All professional and investigative staff provided to the minority party Members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority Member of the Committee and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such Member.

3. (a) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chairperson of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and, after consultation with the ranking minority Member of the Committee, that the minority party of the Committee is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Chairperson shall fix the compensation of all professional and investigative staff of the Committee.

(c) The ranking minority Members shall fix the compensation of all professional and investigative staff provided to the minority party Members of the Committee.

4. From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, the Chairperson, after consultation with the ranking minority Member, shall designate an amount to be under the direction of the ranking minority Member for the compensa-

tion of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority Members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority Members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

5. It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff be available to all Members of the Committee.

RULE XI—TRAVEL

1. All travel for any Member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee must be authorized by the Chairperson. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chairperson in writing the following:

(a) the purpose of the travel;

(b) the dates during which the travel is to occur;

(c) the names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each; and

(d) the names of Members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

2. In the case of travel outside the United States of Members and staff of the Committee, such Members or staff shall submit a written report to the Chairperson on any such travel including a description of their itinerary, expenses, activities, and pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

3. Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE XII—RECORDS

1. There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the Committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members absent or present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by any one Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

2. Access by any Member, officer or employee of the Committee to any information classified under established national security procedures shall be conducted in accordance with clause 13 of Rule XXIV of the Rules of the House.

3. The transcript of any meeting or hearing shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

4. All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairperson of the Committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

5. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairperson shall notify the ranking minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of that rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented

to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

6. To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

KEEPING THE BUDGET BALANCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget has been hearing testimony from Jacob Lew, the Office of Management and Budget Director. I think there are some portions of the President's budget that America should be very aware of.

Number one, the budget substantially increases spending and the size of government, and, therefore, the opportunity to control more of our individual lives. The President's budget breaks the budget caps that the budget and this Congress agreed to two years ago this coming spring. In the year ending in 2000, there is a \$17 billion expenditure in excess of those discretionary caps that we imposed during the balanced budget resolution.

I am concerned because the discipline of reaching the goal of balancing the budget of the Federal Government and the discipline that that has allowed us, encouraging us individually and collectively to do what was necessary in slowing down the growth of government, has resulted in very strong, good rewards.

We now have a surplus. In 1995, when the majority control changed hands in this body, we were looking at \$200 billion deficits every year for the foreseeable future. Last year we had a surplus of about \$70 billion. This year we are looking at a surplus that could be \$10 billion higher, maybe more.

But, again, we need to remind ourselves that this surplus comes from the extra taxes that workers are paying for Social Security. In other words, we are taking that surplus that is being sent in to support Social Security and using some of that money, some of that surplus, for other spending, but, even so, we still have an overall unified budget surplus.

I think it is interesting that just last week the Congressional Budget Office came out with their economic projections. In their economic projections, they said if we stay with the current caps on spending that we imposed on the balanced budget resolution about two years ago, we would not have to increase the national debt of this country, the debt limit for the national debt of this country.

Let me say that again: Currently the debt that somehow our kids and our grandkids are going to have to pay back, the national debt of this country, is \$5.5 trillion. The debt limit, and Congress is responsible to decide how deep we should be going in debt, the current debt limit legislation allows us to go in

debt up to \$5.95 trillion. I would hope that we do not exceed that. I would hope that we do not obligate our kids and grandkids.

I am also concerned about the President's proposal because it increases taxes \$108 billion over five years. Do you remember last year, this side of the aisle, the Republicans, suggested that we have a \$10 billion tax cut. There was great anxiety on the part of many, saying that was too much of a tax cut.

But, again, this budget that the President has just sent us increases taxes by \$108 billion. I include fee increases as part of that tax increase, because really fees are in effect real taxes. There is \$82 billion technically in taxes and \$26 billion in fees.

I am concerned that the budget reduces money for research. Look, the rest of the world is gaining on us. They are trying to learn how to produce as efficiently as we are. We have got strong challenges for the future. It means not only should we be frugal in not allowing government to grow, reducing our debt, the overall debt of this country, so interest rates will stay low, so that we can encourage economic development and the strength of our economy, but it also means we have to be on the cutting edge of research. I hope as we move ahead on this budget resolution, we will continue to be frugal in cutting out waste in the Federal Government and also we will be looking at prioritizing existing spending to maximize the chance that we can stay ahead of the rest of the world in terms of productivity and competitiveness and ultimately maintain our standard of living.

NIKITIN TRIAL TO PROCEED IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is here to begin his hour presentation, I believe, and I want to thank him for his courtesy in allowing me to claim this five minutes. I am sure that he will join with me and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and others with respect to the very important subject that we wish to devote just a few minutes to today.

Mr. Speaker, surely we can take some time at this particular juncture to devote attention, in this special order, to the difficulties that are now being experienced in what was the former Soviet Union, that is to say, in Russia.

The Supreme Court in a Supreme Court session in Russia is being held on the 4th of February with respect to the Alexander Nikitin case. The case, Mr. Speaker, is important not only to Captain Nikitin and those who are interested in addressing issues of freedom in

Russia, but it has profound consequences for all of us on the planet.

Captain Nikitin has been the leading exponent of making clear what is happening with nuclear deterioration with the submarine fleet in the former Soviet Union. The degradation that is taking place in the environment there is something of concern, not only to the Russian people, but to all of us throughout the world. He is now being tried as a result of trying to bring this information forward in a more clear sense than it has been available before.

I want to indicate for those Members and those who may become aware of the special orders today throughout the Nation that they can contact the Bellona Foundation, B-E-L-L-O-N-A, at P.O. Box 11835 in Washington D.C., 20008, and contact the Bellona Foundation if you want to aid and assist Captain Nikitin in Russia, if you want to become more aware of what is taking place with the deterioration of the nuclear submarines in the former Soviet Union.

The Supreme Court is going to hear the appeal, as I indicated, on Thursday, February 4. I expect a verdict will be there the same day.

For those of you who are not familiar with the case and the circumstances, let me give you a little background very quickly. The Council for Criminal Cases in the Supreme Court in Russia takes many former Soviet dissidents back to the times of the KGB. They have a special department there supervised by the KGB. They used to have one responsible for handling crimes against the state.

I want it understood what is being said in Russia today is to express opinions and to discuss information that is otherwise available publicly, in public, in Russia today, is seen as a point of subversion and treason. That is what Captain Nikitin is being tried for.

So what we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of State pay particular interest and approach their counterparts in Moscow to indicate that the United States is very, very concerned about this situation, that we are watching it, that they are not going to be able to do this behind closed doors and get away with it. They are not used to public hearings in Russia and they are scared to go public on this.

It is very, very important that Captain Nikitin's case be recognized by our Department of State as something that Members of this Congress are very, very concerned about, and I call on other Members to acquaint themselves with the circumstances.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is well aware of it, as I said. He is unable to be with us today to discuss the situation further. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I assure the other Members, this is not the last time that I will be on this floor, nor that individuals like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) will be here.

Let me conclude by indicating to that on a recent Congressional delegation trip to Russia, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) as the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services led a delegation of individuals from the Congress there, and we met with Captain Nikitin.

We can provide you information, Mr. Speaker, on the case in more detail, but we just want to alert you and alert the State Department today that we expect to have this case front and center in the consciences of everyone who is concerned about the environmental degradation taking place in Russia today as a result of the deterioration of the nuclear submarines that are presently being mothballed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

DR. CARAWAY: As you know the Supreme Court will hear the Nikitin appeal on Thursday. The verdict should be announced the same day. We will see then.

Unfortunately, the hearing will take place behind closed doors, somewhat incomprehensible given that the hearing is not about the secrecy question, but about procedural issues.

Yours,

THOMAS JANDL,
Director, Bellona USA.

NIKITIN SUPREME COURT SESSION BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

The Supreme Court session in the Nikitin case on 4 February will be held behind closed doors. The presiding judge, a member of an officially abolished department within the Supreme Court Council for the Criminal Cases, made the decision in fear that state secrets might be released.

The Nikitin case will be tried by the Council for the Criminal Cases of the Supreme Court. Many former Soviet dissidents associate this particular council with the dark times of KGB rule back in the Soviet past. The Council used to have a special department supervised by the KGB and responsible for the handling of crimes against the state. The special department was officially abolished as the 'wind of democracy' swept across the former Soviet Union, but its membership remained intact.

"The judges in the Council have been sitting there for as long as I can recall," says Yuriy Schmidt, defender of Aleksandr Nikitin and former Soviet dissident. "They are not used to open hearings, they are scared to go public," adds Schmidt.

The court will not consider the merits of the case, but rather evaluate the legality of the 29 October 1998 St. Petersburg City Court ruling to send the case back for further investigation.

No legal grounds to have closed session.

"The only legal reference they can find to justify the closed door hearings is the fact that the case formally deals with so-called state secrets," says Yuriy Schmidt. "But the court's task is not to go to the substance of the case, but rather evaluate the legal side of it. What secrets could this constitute," asks Schmidt rhetorically. According to Schmidt, there were quite solid grounds to have the court session behind closed doors in the St. Petersburg City Court as the court was examining the alleged secret material. A substantial part remained open to the public.

"To have the Supreme Court session closed can either be explained by the pressure from the FSB (successor to the KGB) or by the initiative of a KGB-trained judge", says Schmidt.

THE JUDGE'S DECISION

When approached for comments Supreme Court press spokesman Nikolay Gastello said the decision was taken by the presiding judge, Magomed A. Karimov. Gastello could neither comment on the motives of the judge nor say if the judge would change his mind.

"It was not an unexpected decision," says Aleksandr Nikitin, who arrived in Moscow today. "The FSB is there and does whatever it can to win the case."

THE NIKITIN CASE

Aleksandr Nikitin is charged with espionage and disclosure of state secrets while working for the Bellona Foundation. He was arrested by the FSB on 6 February 1996, after writing two chapters of a Bellona report on the risks of radioactive pollution from Russia's Northern Fleet. Jailed for 10 months following his arrest, Nikitin has since been restricted to the city limits of St. Petersburg. His case was then tried in St. Petersburg City Court between October 20 and 29, 1998. The St. Petersburg judge's decision to return the case to further investigation was appealed by both the prosecutor and the defence. Their respective appeals are to be heard in the Supreme Court on 4 February 1999.

Contacts in Moscow: Frederic Hauge and Thomas Nilsen.

Contacts in Oslo: Bellona Main Office.

Contacts in Washington: Thomas Jandl.

More info: <http://www.bellona.no/e/russia/nikitin/mailto:info@bellona.no>

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HONORABLE JIM MCCRERY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Sally Asseff, staff member of the Honorable JIM MCCRERY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I received a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

SALLY ASSEFF.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-191, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. THOMAS of California, Chairman;

Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio;

Mr. NEY of Ohio;

Mr. HOYER of Maryland;

Mr. CLAY of Missouri; and

Mr. FROST of Texas.

There was no objection.

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to my colleagues today about managed care reform, an issue that we must take from the drawing board to the signing ceremony this year.

Last year I joined with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and offered the Patients' Bill of Rights as an amendment on the House floor. While I regret that it did not pass, there may have been at least one good thing about that. In the last few weeks, many HMOs have announced double digit premium increases, because, in my opinion they have not done such a great job in cost containment and their premiums have been loss leaders for years. But you can be sure that if the Patients' Bill of Rights had passed last year, they would be blaming us now for their skyrocketing premiums.

□ 1330

And by the way, how many of their CEOs are taking pay cuts from their multimillion dollar salaries as they are raising their premiums this year?

Mr. Speaker, before discussing how I think Congress will deal with this issue this year, it is important to understand why passage of HMO reform legislation is so important. I will bet that every Member of Congress has heard from constituents describing their own HMO horror story.

We have all seen headlines like: "HMO's Cruel Rules Leave Her Dying for the Doc She Needs." Or: "Ex-New Yorker is Told: Get Castrated So We Can Save Dollars." Or how about this headline: "What His Parents Didn't Know About HMOs May Have Killed This Baby."

Consider the 29-year-old cancer patient whose HMO would not pay for his treatments. The HMO case manager told him instead to hold a fund-raiser. A fund-raiser. Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that campaign finance reform will not stymie this man's efforts to get his cancer treatment.

During congressional hearings two years ago before the Committee on Commerce, we heard testimony from Alan DeMeurers, who lost his wife, Christy, to breast cancer. When a specialist at UCLA recommended that she undergo a bone marrow transplant, her HMO leaned on UCLA to change its medical opinion. Who knows whether Christy would be with her two children today, had her HMO not interfered with her doctor-patient relationship.

Other plans have placed ridiculous burdens on those seeking emergency care. Ask Jacqueline Lee how bad this can be. In the summer of 1996 she was

hiking in the Shenandoah mountains when she fell off a 40-foot cliff. She fractured her skull, her arm, her pelvis; she was semicomatose. She was airlifted to the local hospital and treated. Now, my colleagues will not believe this. Her HMO refused to pay for the services because she had failed to get preauthorization.

I want to ask my colleagues, what was she supposed to do, know that she was going to fall off a cliff? Or maybe as she was laying at the base of that 40-foot cliff, semicomatose, with her non-broken arm she could pull a cellular phone out of her pocket and phone a 1-800 number saying, I need to get to the emergency room?

Colleagues, there are countless other examples. How about the doctor who was treating a drowning victim, a little 6-year-old boy? This physician told me that this little boy had been in the ICU for just a few hours, was hooked up to a ventilator, they were doing everything they could to save his life, but it did not look very promising. As this physician and the little boy's parents were standing around the bedside, just a few hours after admission to the ICU, the phone rings. It is the HMO case manager.

"Well, how is this little boy's condition?" It is pretty critical. "Well, if it is so dismal, have you thought about sending him home on home ventilation?" Think about that. We are fighting to save this little boy's life, and a few hours after admission, the HMO is suggesting, send him home on home ventilation so that we can save a few dollars.

How about the HMOs that refuse to cover cleft lip and cleft palate surgery, saying that these are cosmetic? How about plans that threaten action against doctors who tell their patients about all of their medical options, not just the cheap ones that the plan will provide? How about HMOs manipulating the term "medically necessary" to avoid covering costly procedures?

Because our friends, our neighbors, our fellow workers, or our own families have had these types of experiences, countless polls show that people want Congress to pass managed care reform legislation this year. A recent Kaiser Family Foundation survey found that 78 percent of voters support managed care reform, and a similar percentage support allowing consumers to go to court to sue their health plans if their health plans are guilty of malpractice.

But no public opinion poll can convey the depth of emotion on this issue, except the way movie audiences around the country spontaneously clapped and cheered Helen Hunt's obscenity-laced description of her HMO in the Oscar-winning movie, *As Good As It Gets*. Audiences across the country responded to her plight because they saw the same things happening to their families, their friends, their fellow workers.

Now, the industry responds, well, these cases that you have talked about, they are all just anecdotes. Well, Mr.

Speaker, to paraphrase Shakespeare, "Hath not these anecdotes?" these HMO victims, "Hath not these anecdotes' hands, organs, senses, passions" the same as a HMO apologist? And if you prick these anecdotes, do they not bleed? If you tickle those anecdotes, do they not laugh? And if you cut short their care for profits, might they not die?

Last year I and some others crossed party lines to push for passage of the Patients' Bill of Rights. This is a good bill. It would have done a lot to deal with the end of the constant stream of HMO abuses similar to the ones I have talked about.

It contained, for example, strong language ensuring that health plans pay for emergency care. Think of the plight of James Adams, age 6 months. At 3:30 in the morning his mother, Lamona, found him hot, panting, moaning. His temperature was 104 degrees. Lamona phoned her HMO and was told to take little Jimmy to the Scottish Rite Hospital. Quote: "That is the only hospital I can send you to," said the HMO reviewer. "How do I get there?" Lamona asked. "I don't know," the nurse said. "I'm not good at directions."

Well, about 20 miles into their ride, little Jimmy's parents passed Emory University Hospital, a renowned pediatric center. Then they passed Georgia Baptist and Grady Memorial, but they did not have permission to stop there, and so they drove on. They had 22 more miles to travel to get to Scottish Rite Hospital, and while searching for Scottish Rite, James' heart stopped.

There is a scene in the recent movie, *Civil Action*, showing a mother and a father in a car on the side of the road administering CPR to their child. Think of little Jimmy Adams when you see that scene.

Well, Lamona eventually got Jimmy to the hospital, but because he had had an arrest, it looked like he was going to die. Jimmy was a tough little guy, though, and despite his cardiac arrest due to the delay in treatment by his HMO, he survived. However, the doctors taking care of little Jimmy had to amputate both his hands and both his feet because of gangrene related to the arrest.

All of this is documented in the book, *Health Against Wealth*. As the details of baby James' HMO's methods emerged, it became clear that the margins of safety in HMOs can be razor thin. Maybe as thin as the scalpel that amputated Jimmy's hands and feet.

Think of the dilemma an HMO places on a mother struggling to make ends meet. In Lamona's situation, if she takes her child to the nearest emergency room, she could be at risk for hundreds or even thousands of dollars in uncovered charges. Or she could hope that her child's condition will not get worse as they drive past other hospitals that additional 22 miles to get to the nearest ER authorized by that HMO.

A strong HMO reform bill would ensure that consumers do not have to

make that type of potentially disastrous choice.

Last year we had support from consumer groups and from a number of nonprofit health plans calling for Federal legislation. These health plans and consumer groups wrote, "Together, we are seeking to address problems that have led to a decline in consumer confidence and trust in health plans. We believe that thoughtfully designed health plan standards will help to restore confidence and ensure needed protection."

And noting that they already made extensive efforts to improve the quality of their care, the chief executive officer of one of these plans said, "We intend to insist on even higher standards of behavior within our own industry, and we are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that result."

Let me repeat that. The CEO of one of the country's largest HMOs said, "We are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that result."

So in recognition of the problems in managed care, these three managed care plans, along with consumer groups, got together and endorsed nationally enforceable standards. Things like guaranteeing access to appropriate services, providing people with a choice of health plans, ensuring the confidentiality of medical records, protecting the continuity of care, providing consumers with relevant information, covering emergency care, banning gag rules.

Well, I am sad to say that despite strong public support to correct problems like these and the support of many responsible managed care plans, the legislation stalled in Washington last year. That is truly unfortunate, since the problem demands Federal action.

Mr. Speaker, historically State insurance commissioners have done a good job of monitoring the performance of the health plans in their States. But Federal law puts most HMOs beyond the reach of State regulations.

How is this possible? More than two decades ago Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which I will refer to as ERISA, in order to provide some uniformity for pension plans in dealing with different State laws. Health plans were included in ERISA almost as an afterthought. But the result has been a gaping regulatory loophole for self-insured plans under ERISA.

And even more alarming is the fact that this lack of effective regulation is coupled with an immunity from liability for negligent actions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, personal responsibility has been a watchword for this Republican Congress, and this issue should be no different. Health plans that recklessly deny needed medical service should be made to answer for their conduct. Laws that shield them from their responsibility only encourage HMOs to cut corners. Congress cre-

ated this ERISA loophole, and, Mr. Speaker, Congress should fix it.

Think for a moment about buying a car. Mr. Speaker, I often hear from opponents to this legislation, well, this managed care legislation, this could lead to socialized medicine. But think about buying a car. Federal laws ensure that cars have horns, brakes and headlights. Yet, despite these minimum standards, we do not have a nationalized auto industry. Instead, consumers have lots of choices. But they know that whatever car they buy, that car has to meet certain minimum safety standards. One does not buy safety "a la carte".

The same notion of basic protections and standards should, in my opinion, apply to health plans. Consumer protections will not lead to socialized medicine any more than requiring seat belts has led to a nationalized auto industry.

□ 1345

In a free market, these minimum standards set a level playing field that allows competition to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, let me share some thoughts on how I think this issue will evolve in the coming months. As we know, we came close to passing the Patients' Bill of Rights last year. Already, however, I see signs that a partisan fight could break out again this year.

While I continue to support the Patients' Bill of Rights and I wish it had passed, I do not want us to get hung up on or let reform die on the altar of partisanship like the opponents to the legislation used last year.

So I decided not to cosponsor the Patients' Bill of Rights this year when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) introduces it. Instead, I am going to introduce my own bill, probably next week. While my bill will keep the best features of the Patients' Bill of Rights, it will also eliminate some of the provisions that would add regulatory burdens on health plans without really adding much in the way of increased patient safety.

In addition, my bill will have a new formulation on the issue of health plan liability. I continue to believe that health plans which make negligent medical decisions should be accountable for their actions, but Mr. Speaker, winning a lawsuit is little consolation to a family who has lost a loved one.

The best HMO bill will ensure that health care is delivered when it is needed, and to encourage that, the bill which I will drop next week will provide for both an internal and an external appeals process. But unlike last year's Patient Protection Act, the external review will be binding on the plan. It could be requested by either the patient or the health plan. The review would be done by an independent panel of medical experts.

Do external appeals work? A recent review in New York shows that half of all internal appeals are decided in

favor of the patient. But that also means that half of the time the HMO's decisions are upheld. The important thing is to get the proper treatment for the patient in a timely way, not necessarily to end the post mortem in a court.

So I will propose that where there is a dispute on denial of care, either the patient or the HMO can take this dispute to an independent peer panel for a binding decision. If the plan follows that decision, there could not be punitive damages against the HMO, since there can be no malice if they bind themselves to the decision of an independent panel of experts.

I suspect that Aetna today wishes they had had an independent peer panel available, even with a binding decision on care, when it denied care to David Goodrich. Last week a California jury handed down a verdict with \$116 million in punitive damages to David Goodrich's wife, Teresa. If Aetna or the Goodriches had had the ability to send that denial of care to an external review, they could have avoided the courtroom. But Mr. Speaker, more importantly, David Goodrich might be alive today.

That is why my plan should be attractive to both sides of the aisle. Consumers get a reliable and quick external appeals process which will help them get the care they need. They can go to court to collect economic damages or lost wages, future medical care. But if the plan follows the external review's decision, the patient cannot sue for punitive damages.

HMOs, whose greatest fear is of a \$50 or a \$100 million punitive damage award, can shield themselves from those astronomic awards, but only if they follow the recommendations of an independent review panel, which is free to make its own decision about what care is medically necessary, as long as there is not a specific exclusion of coverage of a benefit; i.e., a plan says up front to an enrollee, we do not cover liver transplants.

I have shared this approach with a number of my colleagues as well as consumer groups, businesses, health plans. I have been encouraged by the positive responses that I have received. I think this could be the basis for the bipartisan solution to this problem.

In fact, I recently spoke with the CEO of a large Blue Cross plan who confided to me that his organization is already implementing virtually all of the recommendations of the President's Health Care Quality Advisory Commission at little or no cost, probably no premium increase.

But the one part of the health care debate that concerns him is the issue of liability. He indicated that shielding plans from punitive damages when they follow an external review body would strike an appropriate balance.

Mr. Speaker, passage of real patient protection legislation is going to require a lot of hard work, dedication, and seeking a consensus and a com-

promise. My new bill represents an effort to break through the partisan gridlock that we saw last year, and to move this issue forward and get a solution signed into law.

I hope that my colleagues will sign on as original cosponsors to the Managed Care Reform Act of 1999. If Members have any questions about parts of this bill or if they want to sign on, please give my office a phone call.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISASTER MITIGATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) in introducing the Disaster Mitigation Act of 1999.

This widely-supported bipartisan legislation passed the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure last year, after months of hearings and review by the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, which I am privileged to chair. Similar legislation moved through the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The 106th Congress should give priority consideration to the Disaster Mitigation Act.

The introduced bill, essentially unchanged from the bill the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported last year, H.R. 3869, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, and to control the Federal cost of disaster assistance.

The two themes of the bill, greater emphasis on mitigation and greater program efficiency, will reduce the cost and suffering natural disasters place on communities and the Nation overall.

Improving our Nation's outdated flood plain maps is a prime example of an area where new technologies can save us millions of dollars. Computerized mapping makes eminent fiscal sense, and may ultimately save thousands of lives. Boy, that is a double-header worthy of strong, strong support.

I look forward to working with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and State and local governments and other public and private sector entities and citizens to continue the effort to make disaster mitigation a national priority.

It makes far more sense to take action prior to a disaster to minimize the negative impact of that disaster. That makes so much more sense than to do what we have been doing year after year after year: A disaster comes, there is so much suffering, our hearts are pulled at, and we obviously respond. That is what government needs to do,

but far better to minimize the impact before the disaster than to react to the disaster after it has occurred.

I am particularly pleased about the prospects of working with the chairwoman, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. TILLIE FOWLER) and the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JIM TRAFICANT) on the new Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Emergency Management, which has jurisdiction over the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Jurisdiction has been transferred from my subcommittee to the subcommittee of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER). I have already had extensive conversations with her. She is very much in support of this effort. I look forward to working with her. I think it is going to be a productive partnership, and it is going to be bipartisan, Mr. Speaker.

My hope is that the legislation reported by the committee last year and reintroduced today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and me will help the subcommittee as it reviews FEMA programs and considers legislation to improve the Nation's approach to disasters.

RESPONSES TO CONSTITUENTS' CONCERNS: THE READING OF THE MAILBAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little time today to talk to the people back in my home district. My office receives many, many letters from constituents on numerous subjects, and I would like to read a few of them and answer them right here on the floor of the House. Let me begin. I call this the reading of the mailbag.

Mailbag letter number one. My first letter comes from Reinhold Maschhoff of Nashville, Illinois, who wrote to me about low hog prices.

"Dear sir, I am writing you about the low price on hogs. . . . First of all, I'm 80 years of age and doing some work. My wife is very active and does a lot of volunteer work at the hospital and nursing home.

"We used to live on a farm. However, my son farms and has a family. He farms only 300 acres. The rest has to come out of livestock. . . . This has made a good living for them. Now since August he has been losing money, \$25 to \$30 a pig.

"I think of all the work he does, and then to think he is losing money, as much as \$2,500 a load. This will lead to bankruptcy. What are you doing about it? Sincerely, Reinhold Maschhoff."

My response is that the recently rock bottom hog prices are a very real problem in Illinois. Literally hundreds of farmers have contacted me about this crisis, including Ruth Rensing of New Douglas, Illinois, and Daniel Matthews of Nokomis, Illinois.

Although no one has a quick and easy solution for these prices, I want to talk about what Congress and the Federal Government is doing right now. I recently held a series of meetings on the hog crisis with family farmers back in the 20th District of Illinois. Local farmers, agricultural leaders, and government officials met together in Springfield, Mt. Vernon, and Pittsfield, Illinois, to discuss their concerns in the hog industry, and to talk about any short- and long-term remedies that were available. I will briefly highlight a few here.

In order to help farmers suffering from low prices, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced several procedures to stem the hog crisis. The USDA will allow farmers to defer loan payments, and has made available payments to some struggling hog farmers. The agency has also brought \$70 million worth of pork for food aid programs.

While I realize this help is really a drop in the bucket compared to what many farmers have lost, I would encourage any farmers wishing to participate to contact either my district office or their local Farm Service Agency office.

Responding to the concerns of many small farmers in central and southern Illinois, I am in strong support of the Department of Justice's review of the agricultural industry, making sure that small- and medium-sized family farmers are not pushed out of the markets by larger companies.

I have also written and signed several letters to key agricultural leaders in Washington, including the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), Agriculture Secretary Glickman, and House leadership, asking each to consider any help that is available for struggling farmers, like the Maschhoff family.

□ 1400

With the help of dozens of farmers who attended my district hog crisis meetings, we came to the conclusion that although we have no quick and easy answers for low prices, Congress can take action to prevent this from happening in the future. By renewing fast track trade authority, helping farmers find new markets, passing new trade bills and making sure farmers can easily get their products to market, Congress can help our struggling pork producers and hog farmers.

Thank you for the letter, Reinhold.

Letter number two, my next letter comes from Brent Barnes of Beecher City, Illinois. This letter's topic is a fair tax bill.

On January 11th, Mr. Barnes wrote: "Dear Representative SHIMKUS, as a constituent, I urge you to support the fair tax bill legislation that will allow every American the opportunity to save more for education, a home or a better retirement. The fair tax is a national sales tax system that is fair,

simple and efficient. It will allow me to keep my whole paycheck, and I will never have to file a tax return again.

"I urge you to support this bill and to please respond in writing to my request for information about your position on the fair tax. Signed Brent Barnes."

Thanks for your letter, Brent. I like the sound of this legislation. I hope you know that when I ran for office and now as your Congressman, I believe strongly that we must reform our Tax Code. Unfortunately, I do not think the President is as interested in the idea as we are here in Congress.

Nonetheless, I did a little digging on the fair tax on the Internet and found the Americans for Fair Taxation website. This website did a good job of describing this new tax structure, which I would like to take a moment to discuss.

First, all Federal income taxes, including the onerous death tax, are abolished and replaced by a single-rate Federal sales tax collected only once at the point of sale, a Federal sales tax.

The fair tax proposal provides a monthly rebate to all individuals so that no American will pay taxes on the purchase of necessities.

Most importantly, this proposal empowers individuals. Americans can only be taxed when they go to the store and purchase goods. This is fundamentally different than the current Tax Code which taxes Americans just for earning money.

This proposal will also eliminate the Internal Revenue Service. As so many Americans know, our confusing Tax Code has forced the IRS and its agents to issue confusing rulings which only undermines the public's trust in the Federal Tax Code.

The fair tax also makes tax evasion more difficult since retailers will now administer this tax just as they administer State sales taxes. American citizens will no longer need to file for their tax returns.

To Mr. Barnes, back in Fayette County, I would like to say that I have not reached a decision on whether to support a national sales tax or a flat tax at this point. Both systems have merit.

As you know, in the State of Illinois, we have both. We have a flat income tax and a sales tax. But I will continue to study this issue and promote reform on the Tax Code as I serve you in this Congress.

Realistically speaking, I believe fundamental tax reform is at least 2 years off. However, in the near term, the Congress is advancing a simple plan to reduce taxes by 10 percent across the board. After we save Social Security, with the surplus dollars, we can return the leftover funds to the taxpayers. After all, it is your money. Thank you for bringing this legislation to my attention, Brent. I will be sending a follow-up letter within the next few days.

Letter number 3, I recently received another letter from Mr. Robert Devore

in Beecher City, Illinois. In his letter regarding the military, he writes: "Dear sir, I know you are a veteran, as I am. I served over 9 years on active duty in the United States Navy, including two trips to Vietnam. My interest concerns how the military is treating their members.

"I have a good friend in St. Elmo, Illinois, whose son enlisted in the Navy a year ago. He went to Great Lakes for 3 weeks' training prior to joining the fleet in a squadron aboard an aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf. While going through training at Great Lakes, he was required to pay for his meals.

"I have another friend whose son enlisted in the Air Force. His son was required to purchase his own bedding, sheets, et cetera, and pay for his meals. How can the military do this? Sincerely Robert L. Devore."

My response stems from concerns about how the military was treating not only active members but also those who are retired, and were expressed by Odie Farris of Mount Vernon, Connie Mann of Collinsville and Edna Roehl of Staunton.

With poor living conditions, bad pay, lack of access to medical care and disappearing benefits, we are shortchanging the men and women of our armed forces. It is quite ironic that we ask them to put their lives on the line to defend our country, yet we need to provide a food stamp allowance for service members at the lowest pay grades.

Because of continued cuts to our defense budget, recruiting and retention are increasingly difficult, readiness harder to maintain and weapons modernization tougher to fund.

We must properly fund our entire military, from our recent enlistees to those who fought in foreign wars. We should be funding our military more, and I will continue to fight to ensure our military is able to meet our defense needs.

Letter number 4, my final letter this afternoon, is from Rich DuPatz, Sr., from Brighton, Illinois. He writes, "As your constituent, I am writing to urge you to support H.R. 4197, the Citizen's Privacy Protection Act of 1998. This bill would repeal section 656 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which would be a significant step toward establishing a national ID card.

"Section 656 would prohibit Federal agencies from accepting State issued drivers' licenses as valid identification unless the license conforms to a Federal standard, and the State puts the driver's Social Security number on the license or verifies it with the Social Security Administration. As a result, each State would issue ID cards.

"Requiring drivers to turn over their Social Security number is like asking them to provide a virtual pass key to a mountain of private and often sensitive information. A Social Security number is often used by businesses as an identifier. Therefore, it can be used to access a person's medical history, shopping

preferences, use of prescription drugs, household income and other financial information just to name a few.

"Help put the Federal Government out of the national ID business. I strongly encourage you to help protect my privacy by supporting H.R. 4197, and I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this legislation. Signed Mr. Rich DuPatz, Sr."

Well, first of all, Richard, I want to thank you for writing me and expressing your concerns with this issue. When I look at people who maintain their Social Security cards that were originally issued, there is an interesting statement at the bottom. This statement identifies that the Social Security number should only be used for the Social Security system and not used for any other identification purpose. How far we have come since the issuing of those first Social Security cards.

I also want to give you a little background behind the issue that you address. As you stated in your letter, Congress passed a tough illegal immigration bill in 1996 to address a serious problem with illegal immigration and voter fraud. I am sure that you would agree that having illegal aliens voting in our elections is not acceptable, as it would reduce the value of your vote.

To address the issue of illegal immigration and voter fraud, Congress authorized the Department of Transportation to establish national requirements for drivers licenses, making them, in effect, national ID cards. Acting on this authorization, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, commonly known as NHTSA, proposed a new rule, which would provide the basis for a national ID card. The rule would direct that all Federal agencies may accept, as proof of identity, only a driver's license or identification document that conforms strictly to certain specific and uniform Federal requirements.

Rich, I would have to agree with you on your concerns with NHTSA's proposed rule for it goes far beyond Congressional intent, raising serious privacy and civil liberty questions.

To address your concerns, on October 1998, the House of Representatives voted 333 to 95 in support of the omnibus appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1999. The following day, President Clinton signed it into law. Contained within this appropriation bill was a provision which prohibits NHTSA from issuing a final rule on national identification cards as required under section 656 of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

In short, Congress blocked implementation of this rule. For now, our civil liberties are protected but rest assured, I will continue to watch for over zealous bureaucrats or misinterpretations of Congressional intent in the future.

I would like to close my remarks for this afternoon, but before I go I want

to thank my constituents who wrote my office. I hope that my responses answered their questions fully and to each of my constituents who I mentioned today, you will be receiving a follow-up copy of my remarks in the mail shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letters.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 17, 1998.

DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture
(USDA), Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: As I am sure you are aware, the prices for hogs moving from farms to the market are at their lowest levels in over 30 years.

I have spoken recently with many farmers in my district in central and southwestern Illinois, and they have shared with me their deep concerns about hog prices that have dropped to as low as 5 cents per pound, from 30 cents per pound less than 1 year ago. Many farmers in my district are losing money on every hog they sell, surrendering thousands of dollars every week, some on the verge of losing their farms altogether.

It is also my understanding that labor circumstances in Canada, and a short supply of space in packing plants across the country have helped to fuel this agriculture crisis.

While in the past many grain and commodity farmers relied on government control of the marketplace, hog farmers have traditionally been free of government intervention. However, I feel the government can not stand idly by, while farmers in my district lose their farms, especially due to circumstances beyond their control.

Today my office was in contact with Mr. Enrique Figueroa of the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service regarding what steps the Department is taking toward helping our farmers out of a very grave crisis. During our meeting, he indicated to me that the \$50 million purchase of hogs for food assistance will be accelerated, pork will be included in the upcoming allocation of credit guarantees to support exports to South Korea, a Pork Crisis Task Force will be created, and the FSA and USDA will be involved in restructuring loans and loan practices in order to help pork producers deal with recent losses.

I would respectfully urge you to expedite those actions you have proposed with all due diligence, and to take any other necessary steps to help these struggling farmers in Illinois and across the country.

Hog farmers in Illinois are among the most safe, efficient and reliable producers in the world, and we must allow them the opportunity to survive in what has recently become a very volatile marketplace.

In the coming days and weeks, I will continue to be in close contact with pork producers in my district and with the Department, to ensure that family farmers in my district have every opportunity for a bright and secure future.

Thank you for your prompt action and consideration. Please feel free to contact me, as time is short for many farmers in my district.

Sincerely,
JOHN SHIMKUS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 1999.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMBEST: As I am sure you are aware, the prices for hogs moving from

farms to the market are at their lowest levels in over 30 years.

I have spoken recently with many farmers in my district in central and southwestern Illinois, and they have shared with me their deep concerns about hog prices that have dropped to as low as 5 cents per pound, from 35-40 cents per pound less than 1 year ago. Many farmers in my district are losing money on every hog they sell, surrendering thousands of dollars every week, some on the verge of losing their farms.

It is also my understanding that labor circumstances in Canada, and a short supply of space in packing plants across the country have helped to fuel this agriculture crisis.

While in the past many grain and commodity farmers relied on government control of the marketplace, hog farmers have traditionally been free of government intervention. However, I feel the government can not stand idly by, while farmers in my district lose their farms, especially due to circumstances beyond their control.

I urge you to take action to help our family farmers see their way through this crisis. Hog farmers in Illinois are among the most safe, efficient and reliable producers in the world, and we must allow them the opportunity to survive in what has recently become a very volatile marketplace.

Thank you for your prompt action and consideration. Please feel free to contact me, as time is short for many farmers in my district.

Sincerely,
JOHN SHIMKUS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 1999.
Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD GEPHARDT,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MESSRS. HASTERT AND GEPHARDT: We are writing to alert you to the severe problems facing family farmers in the pork industry. Pork prices have plunged to their lowest level since the Great Depression, dropping nearly 80% compared with last year, leaving pork producers struggling to hang on to their farms.

On January 8, 1999, a number of Members met with Under Secretary Mike Dunn and several other high-ranking USDA officials to exchange ideas about what can be done to bring relief to our nation's hog farmers. Those present at the meeting agreed that this issue is of utmost importance and needs to be addressed quickly by both the Administration and the Congress.

We are working together to develop a plan that can be brought to the entire House for passage and implementation. We are willing to discuss any idea that can assist our pork producers, from changing current USDA regulations to providing supplemental appropriations.

It is essential that the Leadership of Congress work in a bipartisan manner to allow Congress to take the necessary steps to address this important issue in an expeditious manner. We believe Congress needs to act as soon as possible, but certainly prior to the beginning of the spring planting season at the end of March.

Thank you in advance for your serious consideration of our request. We look forward to working with you to improve the economic conditions facing America's pork producers.

Sincerely,
Jim Nussle; David Minge; Leonard L. Boswell; Bill Barrett; Ray LaHood; Jerry Weller; John Shimkus; Jerry F. Costello; Jim Leach; Earl Pomeroy;

Ron Kind; Thomas Ewing; Marion Berry; Tom Latham; Gil Gutknecht; Lane Evans; Doug Bereuter; David Phelps; Bob Etheridge; David McIntosh; Debbie Stabenow; John Thune.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1503

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 350, MANDATES INFORMATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 36) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 350) to improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal private sector mandates, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SKEEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. JONES of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHAFER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

307. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenprothrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300763; FRL 6047-3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

308. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300771; FRL 6051-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

309. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300770; FRL-6049-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

310. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions—received January 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

311. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants; National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions From Phosphogypsum Stacks [FRL-6229-4] (RIN: 2060-AF04) received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

312. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and

Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: Approval of Revisions to Georgia State Implementation Plan; Vehicle Inspection/Maintenance Program [GA 34-2-9902a; FRL-6227-7] received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

313. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Waivers for PM10 Sampling Frequency—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

314. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Plan for PM2.5 NAAQS Review [FRL-5913-4] received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

315. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance for Network Design and Optimum Site Exposure for PM2.5 and PM10—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

316. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Implementation Plan—PM2.5 Monitoring Program—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

317. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Implementation of New Source Review Requirements for PM2.5—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

318. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance for Implementing the 1-Hour Ozone and Pre-existing PM10 NAAQS—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

319. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance on Mitigation of Impact to Small Business While Implementing Air Quality Standards and Regulations—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

320. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Early Planning Guidance for the Revised Ozone and Particulate Matter (PM) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

321. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Air Quality Policy on Wildland and Prescribed Fires—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

322. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Collection and Reporting of PM10 Data—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

323. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Guidance

on Data Handling Conventions for the 8-Hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

324. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—PM_{2.5} Site Types and Sampling Frequency During CY-99—received January 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

325. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ambient Air Quality Surveillance for Lead [AD-FRL-6221-2] (RIN: 2060-AF71) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

326. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake City Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, and Approval of Related Revisions [UT-001-0002a; FRL-6201-8] received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

327. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District [CA 211-0117a; FRL-6213-5] received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

328. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Confirmation of Approval and Technical Amendment to Update the EPA Listing of OMB Approval Numbers Under the Paperwork Reduction Act [OPPTS-66009D; FRL-6048-8] (RIN: 2070-AC01) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

329. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—"Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Exempt Distribution Licenses," dated September 1998—received January 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

330. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—"Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about Self-Shielded Irradiator Licenses," dated October 1998—received January 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

331. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—"Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about Fixed Gauges Licenses," dated October 1998—received January 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

332. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Lead Agency Responsibility (RIN: 3206-A148) received January 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

333. A letter from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting a report on the applicability to the legislative branch of federal law relating to terms and conditions of employment and access to public services and accommodations, pursuant to Public Law 104-1, section 102(b)(2) (109 Stat. 6); jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 36. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 350) to improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal private sector mandates, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KASICH (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 3. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income tax rates by 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 514. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. CARSON (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 515. A bill to prevent children from injuring themselves with handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 516. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal banking agencies from implementing "know your customer" regulations which overburden financial institutions and invade the privacy of United States citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 517. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network established by the Secretary of the Treasury to allow an individual to obtain a copy of any record maintained by the Network pertaining to such person and to have corrections made to such records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 518. A bill to sunset the provisions of subchapters II and III of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, and chapter 2 of Public Law 91-508; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to remove the limitation on the amount of outside income which a Social Security beneficiary may earn while receiving benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 520. A bill relating to the period of availability of certain emergency relief funds allocated under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for carrying out a project to repair or reconstruct a portion of a Federal-aid primary route in San Mateo County, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 521. A bill concerning denial of passports to noncustodial parents subject to State arrest warrants in cases of nonpayment of child support; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 522. A bill to amend the Federal Rules of Evidence to establish a parent-child privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 523. A bill to encourage States to enter into agreements with other States for the establishment of conforming regulations governing the provision of limousine service between the States; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 524. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography

for any class of covered individuals if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography for such class, and to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of annual screening mammography; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. FORD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MOORE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 525. A bill to provide for the defense of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 526. A bill to protect the retirement security of Americans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 527. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to provide that a contractor under that Act who has repeated violations of the Act shall have its contract with the United States canceled and to require the disclosure under freedom of information provisions of Federal law of certain payroll information under contracts subject to the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 528. A bill to amend section 353 of the Public Health Service Act to exempt physician office laboratories from the clinical laboratory requirements of that section; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan:

H.R. 529. A bill to require the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to approve a permit required for importation of certain wildlife items taken in Tajikistan; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 530. A bill to provide that the "Know Your Customer" regulations proposed by the Federal banking agencies may not take effect unless such regulations are specifically authorized by a subsequent Act of Congress and to require the Federal banking agencies to conduct a comprehensive study on various economic and privacy issues raised by the proposed regulations and submit a report on such study to the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BLILEY:

H.R. 531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount allowable for qualified adoption expenses, to permanently extend the credit for adoption expenses, and to adjust the limitations on such credit for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 532. A bill to amend the Act of September 30, 1961, to limit the antitrust exemption applicable to broadcasting agreements made by leagues of professional sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 533. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize programs for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BONO:

H.R. 534. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code to permit each party to certain contracts to accept or reject arbitration as a means of settling disputes under the contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 535. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 536. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the establishment of a regional or branch office of the Small Business Administration in each State; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SMITH of Washing-

ton, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 537. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for budgeting for emergencies through the establishment of a budget reserve account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEMENT (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. REYES, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 538. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers who attain age 65 in or after 1982 and to whom applies the 15-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DANNER:

H.R. 539. A bill to establish 9-1-1 as the universal emergency assistance number for wireless telecommunications users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 540. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit transfers or discharges of residents of nursing facilities as a result of a voluntary withdrawal from participation in the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 541. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 542. A bill to reduce the number of Trident ballistic missile submarines subject to a statutory limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems and to provide that any funds saved by retiring such submarines should be used for national missile defense programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 543. A bill to require the installation and use by schools and libraries of a technology for filtering or blocking material on the Internet on computers with Internet access to be eligible to receive or retain universal service assistance; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the small issuer exemption from pro rata allocation of interest expense of financial institutions to tax-exempt interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 545. A bill to combat fraud in, and to improve the administration of, the disability programs under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 546. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the sanctity of religious communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 548. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a just apportionment of Representatives in Congress for all States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 549. A bill to provide for the non-prescription of State prescription drug benefit laws in connection with MedicareChoice plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 550. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that persons who have been convicted of a capital crime may not be awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 551. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that military reserv-

ists who are retained in active status after qualifying for reserve retired pay shall be given credit toward computation of such retired pay for service performed after so qualifying; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNULTY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. KOLBE):

H.R. 552. A bill to provide for award of the Navy Combat Action Ribbon based upon participation in ground or surface combat as a member of the Navy or Marine Corps during the period between July 4, 1943, and March 1, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 553. A bill to prohibit discrimination by the States on the basis of nonresidency in the licensing of dental health care professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 554. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow roll-over contributions to individual retirement plans from deferred compensation plans maintained by States and local governments and to allow State and local governments to maintain 401(k) plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 555. A bill to require States to equalize funding for education throughout the State; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MICA (for himself and Mr. PICKETT):

H.R. 556. A bill to amend titles 5 and 37 of the United States Code to allow members of the armed forces to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 557. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide a safe harbor under the anti-kickback statute for hospital restocking of certain ambulance drugs and supplies; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 558. A bill to provide for the retrocession of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 559. A bill to provide for the continuation of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO:

H.R. 560. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 300 Recinto Sur Street in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo United States Post Office and Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 561. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the operation in certain metropolitan areas of civil subsonic turbojets that fail to comply with stage 3 noise levels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 562. A bill to approve and ratify certain transfers of land and natural resources by or on behalf of the Delaware Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 563. A bill to encourage Members of Congress and the executive branch to be honest with the public about true on-budget circumstances, to exclude the Social Security trust funds from the annual Federal budget baseline, to prohibit Social Security trust funds surpluses to be used as off-sets for tax cuts or spending increases, and to exclude the Social Security trust funds from official budget surplus/deficit pronouncements; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 564. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income taxes by increasing the amount of taxable income which is taxed at the lowest income tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABO, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 566. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct Stand Down events and to establish a pilot program that will provide for an annual Stand Down event in each State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 567. A bill to assure that the services of a nonemergency department physician are available to hospital patients 24-hours-a-day, seven days a week in all non-Federal hospitals with at least 100 licensed beds; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. SISKY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 568. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992 to choose either lump sum payments over four years totalling \$5,000 or an improved benefit computation formula under a new 10-year rule governing the transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FALCONA, Ms. DELAUNO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to commemorate the birthday of Cesar E. Chavez; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing that the President should seek a public renunciation by the People's Republic of China of any use of force, or threat to use force, against Taiwan, and that the United States should help Taiwan in case of threats or a military attack by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that during 1999 the Secretaries of the military departments should provide honor guard details for the funerals of veterans in the same manner as is required by law effective January 1, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 37. A resolution requiring the House of Representatives to take any legislative action necessary to verify the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment as a part of the Constitution, when the legislatures of an additional 3 States ratify the

Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DIXON):

H. Res. 38. A resolution prohibiting the payment of any amount from the reserve fund established for unanticipated expenses of committees without the approval of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. McNULTY introduced a bill (H.R. 569) for the relief of Henry Johnson; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 53: Mr. FROST, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 114: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 116: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 165: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 179: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 196: Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 206: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 208: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 239: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FORD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FROST, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. REYES, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 253: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 271: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 323: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 324: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 327: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 352: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 358: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 360: Mr. FROST, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 362: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 363: Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HORN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 364: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 365: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 366: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 368: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 371: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 372: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 373: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 407: Mr. GOODE and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 430: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 434: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 436: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 438: Mr. SAWYER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 439: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 447: Mr. LAZIO of New York.

H.R. 488: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 489: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 506: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. TURNER.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. GOODE.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. GOSS.

H. Res. 16: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mrs. KELLY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 393: Mr. MCINNIS.